

A Level

History A

Session: 2010 June
Type: Mark scheme
Code: H106-H506
Units: F961; F962; F963; F964; F966

History

Advanced Subsidiary GCE F961/01

British History Period Studies. Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1035-1642

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs and corresponds to the UMS

2 answers: each maximum mark 50.

	A01a	A01b
IA	21-24	24-26
IB	18-20	22-23
II	16-17	19-21
III	14-15	16-18
IV	12-13	13-15
V	9-11	11-12
VI	4-8	6-10
VII	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
Total mark for each question = 50	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: - 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, detailed 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;">21-24</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context • Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed and substantiated explanations, some of which may be unexpected • The argument evaluates a range of relevant factors and reaches clearly substantiated judgements about relative importance and/or links. <p style="text-align: center;">24-26</p>
Level IB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly <p style="text-align: center;">18-20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Answer is mostly consistently and relevantly analytical with mostly developed and substantiated explanations • Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context. • 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. <p style="text-align: center;">22-23</p>
Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic • 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;">16-17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description • The analysis of factors and/ or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages. <p style="text-align: center;">19-21</p>

<p>Level III</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic 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 organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated <p style="text-align: center;">14-15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some/uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context • Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events OR answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin. • Answer considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance or linkages between factors/issues • Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions <p style="text-align: center;">16-18</p>
<p>Level IV</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant. • Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication. <p style="text-align: center;">12-13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory. • Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context. • Answer may be largely descriptive/ narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained OR answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis. • Limited points made about importance/links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions <p style="text-align: center;">13-15</p>
<p>Level V</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some relevant accurate historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material also • Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/ inappropriate use • 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 <p style="text-align: center;">9-11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic • General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Attempts at analysis will be weak or generalised, based on plausible but unsubstantiated points or points with very general or inappropriate substantiation OR there may be a relevant but patchy description of events/developments coupled with judgements that are no more than assertions • There will be some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic not address the focus of the question <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>

Level VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy • Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation <p style="text-align: center;">4-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little understanding of key concepts • Very limited understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements • Limited explanation will be very brief/ fragmentary • The answer will be characterised by generalised assertion and/or description/ narratives, often brief <p style="text-align: center;">6-10</p>
Level VII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and 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"> • No understanding of key concepts or historical developments. • No valid explanations • Typically very brief and very descriptive answer <p style="text-align: center;">0-5</p>

Option A: From Anglo-Saxon England to Norman England 1035-1087**1 How successfully did Edward the Confessor deal with the Godwin family?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates may argue that Edward was unsuccessful in handling the Godwin family as they were so powerful, attempts to remove them by exile ultimately failed in 1052, that Edward was forced to marry Edith and link this to the problem created by the succession. There may be some consideration of the problems created by Harold Godwinson's brothers. Others may argue that given the power of the Godwin family, Edward handled them as well as he could. He lacked a firm base of support and therefore was wise to ally with them and cement this by marriage. There may be some suggestion that he tried to limit their future power by his celibacy and naming William as heir, although the latter might be disputed by consideration of the problem of the succession.

2 To what extent was military force the most important factor in overcoming opposition to the rule of William I?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There is a variety of reasons that candidates might consider. Candidates can argue that military force was the most important factor and consider how it was deployed by William; this might involve a consideration of how it was used to crush unrest, such as Exeter or in the Harrying of the North and therefore create fear or it might be linked to his use of castles to deter future unrest or it might be linked to the feudal system, which allowed him to raise a force. However, this can be balanced against other factors such as a divided and weak opposition, a lack of co-ordination between rebellions, the aims of the rebels, the loss of many leading Anglo-Saxons at Hastings and William's use of castles and the feudal system.

3 How far did England become a feudal state during the reign of William I?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to show an understanding of feudalism and feudal tenure, but it should also be remembered that this is a complex topic. It should also be noted that historiography is not a requirement at AS and candidates are not expected to be able to quote the views of different historians to achieve any level, although credit can be given if this is used to support an argument. Feudal tenure was based on land and military service. The King held most of the land with tenants-in-chief, secular barons and great churchmen, holding their land directly from him in return for the provision of knights. The pattern was replicated among the lower orders of society. However, not all England was feudalised by the end of the century. Some groups-townsmen and the population of remoter regions were outside the system. William was willing to adapt as necessary and a number of Norman practices were used because they were useful not because they fitted into the feudal pattern. Indeed the king took care to emphasise the element of continuity in his government. Some may also make mention of the feudal characteristics before the Conquest, such as the link between thegns and land which was useful when the Normans took over.

Lancastrians, Yorkists and Tudors 1450-1509

- 4** 'The power of the nobility was the most important cause of unrest in the period from 1450 to 1470.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It should be noted that the topic begins in 1450 and candidates are not expected to have specific knowledge of the reign of Henry VI, the minority etc, before this date. Candidates might consider the personality of the monarch as it was not one that enabled him to control the nobility. He was open to influence, often to unsound advice, but was also obstinate. His mental health was variable, representing considerable weakness at the head of the state. Candidates will need to examine the power of the nobility and how far they did cause unrest. The nobility included men of strength and ambition such as York, Somerset and Warwick. Rivalry between them could not be controlled, even less resolved by the King. Candidates may examine the role of the Queen, Margaret of Anjou. Candidates might note that the number of disaffected nobility was not great and should not be exaggerated as most of the aristocracy continued to support Henry. There may be discussion as to whether the cause of unrest was due to overmighty subjects or an undermighty king.

- 5** How serious a threat to Henry VII's rule was the Yorkist challenge?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates may consider why the Yorkist challenge was a serious threat and mention the weak nature of Henry VII's claim, although this might be balanced against the death of Richard at Bosworth and the reliance of Yorkists on Pretenders. Many essays may concentrate on the Simnel and Warbeck incidents, linking these to support from abroad, particularly Margaret of Burgundy and Ireland. Some may argue that Simnel was defeated easily at Stoke, but others may suggest that this was a threat because it forced the king into battle, which might have gone the same way as Bosworth. With Warbeck, some may suggest it is simply a nuisance that drags on, whereas others might suggest it was a threat as it influenced foreign policy. Candidates might also consider other Yorkist threats such as Stafford/Lovell. It might be argued that this was not serious as it was easily dealt with, but others might suggest it was a threat because it occurred so early in the reign. There might also be discussion of the challenge from Suffolk and how Henry was lucky to crush the threat. Some might also mention the possible link between the Yorkshire rising and a Yorkist link, but are likely to suggest this was not a threat.

- 6** 'The handling of finances was Henry VII most successful domestic achievement.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a number of areas that candidates can consider, but at the higher levels they must write at least a good paragraph on finances, even if they conclude it was not the most successful. Henry was able to bring finances under his personal control and the Chamber became more important. The king took a keen personal interest in accounts, payments and income. Efforts were made to ensure that the crown received its dues and this led to the unpopularity of men such as Empson and Dudley. Bonds and recognisances may feature in answers, either to show financial success or to argue that the control of the nobility was the most important achievement. Candidates may conclude that the financial legacy he left his son is clear evidence that it was a great success. Candidates should weigh this up against other factors such as his control of the nobility. Some may argue that after the Wars of the Roses his control of them was the most significant achievement, particularly given his weak claim. They may point to his carrot and stick policy, although this might be balanced by a consideration of the situation by the end of his reign when it has been argued the nobility were close to rebellion because of the penalties they faced. Some may argue that simply securing the throne was his greatest achievement, particularly given his weak claim and point to his defeat of the Pretenders.

Henry VIII to Mary I 1509-1558**7 'Henry VIII's foreign policy from 1509 to 1529 brought little benefit for England.' How far do you agree?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should consider what the achievements of Henry's foreign policy were and can then use this as a basis to discuss their benefit. The territorial gains of Therouanne and Tournai brought little other than prestige and although they gave hope to Henry's dream of obtaining the French throne, they were never built upon. In many ways victory at Flodden was more significant as it reduced the Scottish threat. There is likely to be some discussion of the benefits of the Treaty of London and the Field of the Cloth of Gold, which although they put England at the centre of the European stage and made her appear to be a major power, brought little of substance. Candidates may consider the alliances made at various stages with France and Spain and whether they brought any gain other than prestige and some might suggest that the number of times Henry was let down by allies was a reflection of England's limited power and this was made very evident at the end of the period. It is possible that some will argue one achievement was having Wolsey made Cardinal and that even this brought no gain as he was unable to bring about the divorce. Candidates may conclude, as did much of the population by their refusal to pay the Amicable Grant, that there was little gain from Henry's aggressive policy.

8 How successful were Henry VIII's wars with France and Scotland in the period from 1540 to 1547?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Much of the last years of Henry's reign were spent at war with France and Scotland. The resounding victory at Solway Moss in 1542 and the subsequent death of James V gave Henry an opportunity to enforce his policy on Scotland. However, attempts to secure Edward's marriage to Mary failed and although Scotland was weaker in this period, the Treaty of Greenwich was not upheld and the resort to force or 'rough wooing' served only to alienate Scotland. It might be argued that the policy had the reverse effect and encouraged the marriage between Mary and the Dauphin, thus strengthening ties between France and Scotland and therefore weakening England's position. Many may argue that the wars with France brought just as little gain, although there might be some mention of the capture of Boulogne, but this should be weighed against the financial cost. There might be some who place this in the wider context and note that Henry was the only ruler to achieve a major victory in this period. It might be argued that he had achieved this alone and could therefore show that England was a military force. However, it is likely that this will be balanced against the financial cost-which was over £2 million and had used up the money gained from the dissolution and caused a policy of debasement to be adopted.

9 How serious were the social and economic problems faced by Edward VI and Mary I?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There were a large number of social and economic problems faced by Edward and Mary and it is not expected that candidates will cover all of them, what is important is the quality of analysis. Although contemporaries were not aware of the population rise some answers may refer to this as the basis of other problems, it was important because it fuelled the price rise and was also the underlying cause of the rise in poverty and vagrancy. The price rise is likely to be the centre of many answers, with better candidates able to show that it was the rise in the price of agricultural goods that was the more serious and may have been an underlying cause of the unrest in 1549. Some answers will use the rebellions of 1549 to show that the problems were serious and they may support this by reference to the demands of the rebels. Enclosure may also feature in answers and again this may be linked to the

grievances of 1549. Better answers might suggest that one of the serious social problems was a growing class divide and again this was evident in the demands and actions of the rebels. The severe action proposed by the Vagrancy Act might prompt some to argue that it was a serious problem, whilst other government legislation on tillage might prompt an argument that the agricultural problems were an issue. There is also the opportunity for candidates to consider the issue of debasement and its impact.

UCLES

Church and State 1529-1589**10 How widespread was criticism of the Church in England on the eve of the Reformation?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Although answers may refer to the debate between historians about the condition of the church, it must be remembered that historiography is not a requirement of AS and is not needed in order to achieve any level. Answers may consider how widespread anticlerical feeling was, although this may lead some to suggest that complaints against the clergy were limited. It is likely that answers will make reference to issues such as the Hunne Case, although some may argue that this was an exception. There may be consideration of the impact of Colet's criticisms or those of Simon Fish, but better answers may suggest that their impact was limited and they were aimed at certain groups. Some may argue that most complaints were levelled against Wolsey and his wealth, linking this to complaints in parliament from lawyers who lost business to church courts. There may be some answers that suggest there was little criticism and show this by arguing that the church was able to fulfil the spiritual needs of the people and that this was reflected in the level of bequests, ordinations and church building. Answers may therefore conclude that the level of criticism was limited.

11 How successful were the governments of Somerset and Northumberland in establishing Protestantism from 1547 to 1553?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The focus of the answer should be on the reign of Edward, although there can be useful reference back to the reign of Henry to establish the situation in 1547. If this approach is taken, much will depend upon the view of the situation in 1547; those who argue that England was still largely catholic may suggest that the governments were less successful than those who argue England was more protestant. It is possible that candidates may argue that legally Protestantism was established and point to the various acts-Second Act of Uniformity and Prayer Book-but others may qualify this and suggest that as these were only brought in at the end of the period there was little chance for it to be established. There may be an examination of the situation in the localities and it can be argued that Somerset was not successful, as shown by the Western Rebellion, but it might be argued that the lack of rebellions under Northumberland suggests success. However, some might balance this by suggesting that the failure of Lady Jane Grey and the ease with which Mary restored Catholicism showed that Northumberland had also failed.

12 'Puritanism's influence was always limited from 1558 to 1589.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates might explain what Puritanism was; this might lead some to argue that there were different types and that they had varying degrees of influence. Candidates might consider how far they influenced the religious settlement and some might argue that they forced a more radical settlement on the queen. There might be some reference to the influence of Neale's 'Puritan choir' and their impact and it may be concluded that their influence was limited. It can be argued that puritans within parliament failed to change the settlement and therefore their influence was limited. The death of many leading puritans towards the end of the period might also suggest a decline in influence. The question of prophesyings might be discussed, particularly with reference to Grindal's unwillingness to suppress them and as they were outside the queen's control some might argue they were influential. However, this might be balanced against the actions of Whitgift. Some might also note that many moderate puritans, although dissatisfied with the settlement, preferred to work within the church to change it, but failed and also note that they would rather have Elizabeth's settlement than a catholic monarch, which was the alternative.

England under Elizabeth I 1558-1603

- 13** 'Foreign affairs were the most serious problem facing Elizabeth I in 1558.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The question requires candidates to consider a range of problems that faced Elizabeth on her accession. The specification mentions the condition of government, finance, religion and foreign affairs, although other problems such as social and economic and Elizabeth's legitimacy might be raised. The foreign situation was delicate as catholic powers did see Elizabeth as illegitimate and might undertake a crusade, it might also be noted that England was at war with France and that the situation became more dangerous with peace between France and Spain in 1559. However, it is possible to balance this by considering Philip's need of Elizabeth's support and his preference for her ruling, rather than the French influenced Mary Queen of Scots. This problem might also be linked to the religious situation. Elizabeth had protestant tendencies, but given the foreign situation and support for Catholicism it was difficult for her to impose the settlement she wanted. This might be developed and mention made of the problems she had and actions she had to take to achieve her settlement. Government was an issue as the size of the Privy Council had grown and this limited its efficiency, but Elizabeth also had the problem that many councillors were catholic. There was also the problem of support for her and her need to win over some of the more moderate Catholics. There might also be a discussion of the economic problems Elizabeth inherited; this might include disease and bad harvests.

- 14** To what extent did the power of Parliament increase during the reign of Elizabeth I?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Examiners need to be aware of candidates answering a different question on the issue of conflict or co-operation and being dragged into the historiographical debate between Neale and Elton, which is often just descriptive of their views. Candidates do need to address the issue of power and this often causes difficulties as Parliament was still not a regular or permanent part of the constitution. The Queen could summon, dissolve and prorogue parliament when she wished. Although Parliament was involved in the religious settlement and therefore appeared to be continuing the involvement it had under Henry, it might be noted that even here Elizabeth limited their role later in the reign when some tried to discuss religious issues. It might also be noted that Parliament failed in its attempts to get Elizabeth to name a successor or in discussions over the queen's marriage and this might be used to show that their influence, yet alone power was limited. There might be some consideration of attempts to link supply to redress of grievance, but even this failed. Some might argue that the issue of Monopolies showed that Parliament had some power, but even here Elizabeth made few concessions and the Golden Speech might be used to show how Elizabeth was still able to manipulate parliament. Some might also suggest that the government was able to get its own supporters elected and that would limit parliamentary independence.

- 15** 'Rebellion was the most serious problem Elizabeth I faced in the period from 1588 to 1603.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Elizabeth faced a wide range of problems in this period and candidates do not need to consider all of them to access the higher levels, what is important is the quality of analysis. Candidates may argue that rebellion in Ireland was the most serious problem because of the cost, the time it lasted and the problem of controlling Essex. However, this might be balanced against the lack of threat provided by both the Oxfordshire and Essex risings. Candidates may consider other issues such as the war with Spain, the debate over monopolies and other financial concerns. Some answers may pick up on the social and economic problems

of the 1590s, which were the most severe of the century and argue that food shortages and bad harvests were the most serious as people died from hunger. There may also be consideration of the popularity of the Queen, although some may argue that this was not a problem, as was shown by her Golden Speech.

UCLES

The Early Stuarts and the Origins of the Civil War 1603-1642**16 To what extent was James I's extravagance the most important cause of his financial problems?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There were many reasons for James' financial problems and it is not expected that candidates will discuss them all, what matters is the quality of analysis. They will need to write a good paragraph about the stated factor, even if they conclude that it was not the most important reason. Some answers may link his extravagance to the money spent on favourites, whilst others may link it to his court or his vision of England after the relative poverty of Scotland; it might be argued that this was important because it resulted in problems in parliament. Candidates might consider other issues such as the size of the inherited debt from Elizabeth and the difficulty in reducing it; this might also be linked to the problem of inflation and the war with Spain. There might be some consideration of issues such as Monopolies and Impositions. Candidates might argue that a lack of trust between king and parliament was the main cause of his financial problems and this could be linked to the failure of the Great Contract. Some answers might suggest that differences in approach to foreign policy were also responsible for some of the financial problems and that parliament wanted redress of grievance before supply.

17 Assess the reasons why Charles I's personal rule broke down in the years 1639-40.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a variety of reasons that candidates might consider, but what is important is the quality of the analysis. It was ultimately the war with the Scots that forced Charles to recall parliament and this is likely to feature in many answers. However, this can be linked to the unpopularity of his religious policy in Scotland, particularly the introduction of the Prayer Book. There might be some who argue that personal rule was already starting to break down before this and might use the Hampden Case to argue that the financial measures were being resisted on a greater scale at the end of the period and that this would have led to an inability to continue to rule without parliament. Some candidates might broaden this out and argue that Charles was gradually losing the support of many of the political elite through his policies and that the Ship Money case would only encourage further problems. This might be linked to the fears over the policy of Thorough.

18 'The desire of parliament to increase its power was the most important reason for the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The question suggests that parliament was most responsible for the outbreak of the Civil War and candidates should weigh up their responsibility against the kings. When assessing the responsibility of parliament candidates might argue that it was parliament's policies that alienated many and resulted in the formation of a royalist party, arguing that without this there could not have been a civil war. Candidates might use legislation such as the Grand Remonstrance, the Root and Branch Bill or the Nineteen Propositions to argue that it was the action of parliament that caused the war. There might also be consideration of issues such as the regular calling of parliament or its control over the appointment of ministers, which suggest that parliament wanted to increase its power. However, others might argue that it was the king through acts such as the attempt to arrest the Five Members or even his decision to leave London and raise his standard at Nottingham that caused war.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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

History

Advanced GCE **F961/02**

British History Period Studies. Option B: Modern 1783-1994

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs and corresponds to the UMS

2 answers: each maximum mark 50.

	A01a	A01b
IA	21-24	24-26
IB	18-20	22-23
II	16-17	19-21
III	14-15	16-18
IV	12-13	13-15
V	9-11	11-12
VI	4-8	6-10
VII	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
Total mark for each question = 50	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: - 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, detailed 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;">21-24</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context • Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed and substantiated explanations, some of which may be unexpected • The argument evaluates a range of relevant factors and reaches clearly substantiated judgements about relative importance and/or links. <p style="text-align: center;">24-26</p>
Level IB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly <p style="text-align: center;">18-20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Answer is mostly consistently and relevantly analytical with mostly developed and substantiated explanations • Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context. • 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. <p style="text-align: center;">22-23</p>
Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic • 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;">16-17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description • The analysis of factors and/ or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages. <p style="text-align: center;">19-21</p>

<p>Level III</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic 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 organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated <p style="text-align: center;">14-15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some/uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context • Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events OR answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin. • Answer considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance or linkages between factors/issues • Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions <p style="text-align: center;">16-18</p>
<p>Level IV</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant. • Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication. <p style="text-align: center;">12-13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory. • Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context. • Answer may be largely descriptive/ narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained OR answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis. • Limited points made about importance/links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions <p style="text-align: center;">13-15</p>
<p>Level V</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some relevant accurate historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material also • Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/ inappropriate use • 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 <p style="text-align: center;">9-11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic • General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Attempts at analysis will be weak or generalised, based on plausible but unsubstantiated points or points with very general or inappropriate substantiation OR there may be a relevant but patchy description of events/developments coupled with judgements that are no more than assertions • There will be some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic not address the focus of the question <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>

Level VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy • Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation <p style="text-align: center;">4-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little understanding of key concepts • Very limited understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements • Limited explanation will be very brief/ fragmentary • The answer will be characterised by generalised assertion and/or description/ narratives, often brief <p style="text-align: center;">6-10</p>
Level VII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and 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"> • No understanding of key concepts or historical developments. • No valid explanations • Typically very brief and very descriptive answer <p style="text-align: center;">0-5</p>

Option B: Modern 1783-1994**From Pitt to Peel 1783-1846****1 How successfully did Lord Liverpool's government deal with the radical challenge from 1812 to 1822?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There was a wide ranging radical challenge in this period and candidates will need to assess how successful the government was in handling it. Some answers may look at each of the challenges individually, whilst others will take a more thematic approach. At Level III candidates are likely to simply list the successes and failures of the government, whilst answers in the higher levels will make judgements about the degree of success. Candidates might assess the measures used by the government to deal with the challenge and this may range from the various acts of parliament, such as the Black Acts of 1819, the suspension of Habeas Corpus and the new Seditious Meetings Bill to the use of the yeomanry at Peterloo. Some may argue that the government was not very successful at dealing with the threat and point to the prolonged outbreak of Luddite violence and argue that it only declined because of an improvement in the economic conditions. Candidates might also discuss the handling of the economy as a means of controlling the radical challenge and it might be argued that the Corn Laws provoked rather than helped. The use of spies and agent provocateurs might also be considered, but again their success might be balanced against the small numbers involved in events such as the March of the Blanketeers. Some answers might consider the impact of events such as Peterloo and argue that the sympathy for the protestors suggests that the government was not successful, although others might argue that its dispersal shows the government was successful. The ease with which the Cato St. Conspiracy was dealt with, using spies, might lead some to conclude that ultimately the government was very successful, although others might argue that decline was inevitable once prosperity returned.

2 To what extent did the Great Reform Act achieve the aims of the reformers?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to identify the aims of the act. It must be remembered that the government was largely aristocratic and that they did not want to achieve democracy. Some had been advocates of reform for many years, but they wished to preserve the basis of support for the constitution and to eliminate, or greatly reduce aspects of the electoral system that brought it into disrepute. They wished to conciliate the middle classes and wanted to achieve a better representation of the property and intelligence of the country. It might be argued that the results of the act in practice represented partial fulfilment. The redistribution of seats went some way to correct the imbalance between county and borough members, the important newer towns gained seats and many smaller boroughs lost MPs or returned only one. The number of voters added was limited. However, this might be balanced against corruption which did not completely disappear, although the number of very corrupt constituencies did. They did broaden support for the system, Chartism failed to attract the more strenuous reformers of 1831-2, the existing order was strengthened and the aristocracy continued to dominate.

3 How successful were Peel's Irish reforms from 1829 to 1846?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Better answers are likely to start by identifying Peel's aims in Ireland and it is likely that many will suggest this was to preserve and strengthen the Union by winning the support of the more respectable groups, to avoid civil war, to maintain the status quo in Ireland and to preserve law and order. However, some answers might suggest that his aims were not always the same as his party and that any evaluation of success will need to be linked to particular

groups or individuals. It might be argued that Catholic Emancipation did achieve its goal of avoiding civil war, but some might suggest it did little for the unity of the Tory party and that it underpinned the rise of Catholic nationalism and was a significant blow to the Protestant Constitution. Candidates might consider his handling and prosecution of O'Connell; did he succeed in removing support from him? There might also be reference to his handling of the Reform Association in 1843, the Mass Meetings of 1842-3 and the absence of Church reform. His policies in the 1840s - the attempt at land reform (Devon Commission and Land Bill in 1845), concessions to the Catholic Church (Maynooth) and charitable and educational reform were all firmly opposed by his party. There might also be consideration of his policies towards the Famine.

Liberals and Conservatives 1846-1895**4 How far did Gladstone's first ministry of 1868-1874 fulfil the aims of Gladstonian liberalism?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to show an understanding of liberal criteria if they are to fully engage with the question. They should be aware of issues such as peace, retrenchment or economy, reform of abuses, laissez-faire and the minimalist state. It is likely that candidates will assess the reforms introduced against some of these criteria. It might be argued that equality of opportunity and merit was achieved with the Reform of the Civil Service, Army and Education. Special privileges were attacked and answers might make reference to the Army and Universities. It might be argued that efficiency was achieved through the reform of the Civil Service and through the Judicature Act. The attempts to achieve peace might be examined through his Irish measures and if this approach is taken answers might conclude that although they tried to fulfil his aims they ultimately failed. The achievement of a minimalist state might also be challenged through the Torrens Act. In foreign affairs candidates might argue that settlement was achieved in the Alabama Incident, but this might be balanced against the occupation of Egypt.

5 How far was popular pressure the most important reason for the passing of the Second Reform Act in 1867?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. In order to achieve the higher levels candidates will need to evaluate the importance of popular pressure as a factor pushing reform forward in 1866/7. In considering popular pressure candidates might make reference to the role of middle and working class radicals, the importance of the Hyde Park Riots and the Reform League and Union. There might also be some consideration of whether there was a fear of unrest given the social and economic climate. This might be balanced against Disraeli's belief in the working class and the idea of Tory Democracy. These issues should be balanced against other factors such as the political and personal opportunism of figures such as Disraeli, Derby, Russell and Gladstone. Disraeli feared another Whig-Liberal reform act ensuring their continued electoral dominance and was determined to demonstrate Conservative ability to pass and control major reform. In particular they were concerned to preserve the core rural county votes. Personally, it might be argued that Disraeli was anxious to secure the succession to Derby. Candidates might use examples from the progress of the Bill as examples of opportunism, pointing to the hurried nature of the bill, the flexibility on the Borough franchise to woo Radicals, the Hodgkinson Amendment and the County Qualifications. The Conservative party also had political reasons for passing the Act - to form its first ministry since 1846, to widen the appeal of the party and change its image.

6 To what extent did Disraeli's second ministry of 1874-1880 improve the condition of the people?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The government brought in a number of reforms that might be considered when assessing how far conditions were improved. There might be consideration of how far some of the following helped the working class: Public Health Act, Artisans Dwelling Act, Employers and Workmen's Act, Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, Education Act, Shipping Act, Enclosure of Commons Act and Sale of Food and Drugs Act. Some might argue that some of the acts were still permissive and did not bring benefit, using the artisans dwelling and public health acts to support this view, but some might argue the Conservatives took a paternalistic approach and did want to improve conditions, even for the least respectable of the working classes. At times they were prepared to try and force improvements on the working class, shown by their attitude over Education Act. They were also prepared to

improve the conditions for the workers representatives, the Trade Unions, by allowing peaceful picketing. It might be relevant to argue that they were likely to want to improve conditions for electoral gain or because there was a belief in Tory democracy or developing the ideas of Young England.

UCLES

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1856-1914**7 How far did the aims of British policy in the Balkans remain the same from 1856 to 1902?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Answers are likely to identify the aims of British foreign policy in the Balkans during the period, but at the higher levels candidates will need to focus on 'how far' these remained consistent. Areas that might be considered are the desire to protect Turkey and this might be linked to the desire to prevent Russian expansion into the Balkans (invaded 1854 and 1875) and Mediterranean. The Ottoman Empire was vital for British Mediterranean naval power, communication, trade and Middle Eastern influence. These issues might be linked to the question of the balance of power and the perceived threat to British imperial interests if Russia should have access to a warm water port in the region. In particular, some might argue that the area was the key to protecting the route to India, although some might argue that this diminished with the Suez Canal, although this is debatable.

8 'The growing German threat was the most important reason for Britain ending its policy of splendid isolation.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might choose to agree with the statement and use the growing naval threat or economic growth or apparent German support for British enemies, such as the Boers as evidence to back up their claim. On the other hand some might argue that it was the resolution of colonial issues with France following Fashoda that led to the Entente and therefore an improvement. This might also be linked to the Anglo-Japanese treaty of 1902 and the impact that could have had on relations with France over Russia. This might lead some to argue that British attitudes changed because they wanted to avoid war. It is possible that some will argue that Britain's attitude did not change, the entente did not commit Britain to war and that the policy of splendid isolation was continued.

9 'Britain's entente with France was the most important reason for its decision to go to war in 1914'. How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates must address the importance of the Entente in Britain's decision to go to war, even if they conclude that it was not an important factor. Some may argue that it was the Entente that dragged Britain into war as it forced Britain to side with France in 1914 and that if they had not supported France their trustworthiness would have been lost. However, others will argue that the terms of the Entente did not force Britain to go to war, it was not a military alliance and French generals were concerned about the lack of support they might receive from Britain. Other issues that might be considered include: the invasion of Belgium and the 1839 Treaty; it was this that allowed many Liberal MPs to support the decision, there might be the consideration of whether Britain went to war because of the German threat, particularly naval or whether Britain was concerned about her own status or the balance of power in Europe or to detract from the domestic issues of the Suffragettes, Ireland and Industrial unrest.

Domestic Issues 1918-1951**10 'The loss of working class support was most important reason for the fall of Lloyd George's government in 1922'. How far do you agree?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There were many post war issues that Lloyd George needed to tackle if he was to maintain working class support. In particular candidates might consider the need to maintain war promises such as 'Homes fit for heroes'. This might be contrasted with his ability to head off industrial disputes, especially in coal, which might have kept working class support. There were also problems created by the onset of the Slump, which led to the Geddes Axe and the impact this had on social policies and therefore working class support. However, it is likely that many candidates will suggest there were other more important reasons for the downfall. Many answers might focus on the loss of support among Conservative MPs and the realisation that the party was strong enough to win without him. In considering this, candidates might make reference to the importance of the changing leadership of the party and the role of the Carlton Club meeting. Mistakes made by Lloyd George and therefore his electoral liability among many groups may explain the Conservative decision to abandon the coalition and issues such as Chanak, Ireland and Lloyd George's personal behaviour might also be considered.

11 How successful was Baldwin as leader of the Conservative party?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Baldwin's leadership of the party was constantly challenged by cleverer men who could not understand his masterly inactivity, which reflected the mood of the country after Lloyd George. He was able to project and personify the Conservative image of morally serious, commonsensical, anti-intellectual, honest decency which attracted many middle class voters and some deferential workers. He associated with the BBC and became the first modern media politician. He did make blunders, squandering a reputation for social fairness by agreeing to the Trades Disputes and Trade Union Act in 1927 and he misjudged the electorate in 1929 with 'safety first'. However, against this it can be argued that he was tactically astute, protection provided a clear demarcation between the Conservatives and Coalition Liberals and prevented Chamberlain and Birkenhead from joining Lloyd George and therefore helped to heal party wounds. He was probably wise to 'lose' in 1929. Some might argue that in the longer term his homely image worked against the Party and made it appear unsuitable to deal with the dangers of the 1930s.

12 How far had Britain's economy recovered from the Depression by 1939?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some answers might place the recovery in context and suggest that the country had not suffered as much as other European nations and that confidence was not as low, therefore recovery was easier. Even at the lowest point of the cycle real income and consumption were relatively high and this gave a greater chance for recovery. There was a distinct shortage of housing and the 'new industries' also gave scope for recovery. Some may argue that recovery was expected as the country naturally recovered from the recession. However, the recovery was not complete as the growth of the new industries did not compensate for the decline in the staple industries. Structural problems could not be alleviated and this is reflected in the unemployment levels of 13.8% in 1938. This might be balanced against the increase in GDP, rising real incomes, consumer expenditure, which created a demand for the products of the consumer-orientated industries. There was a growth in consumer stores. Some might argue that the extent of the recovery depended upon the region with the south and east faring much better than the north and west where the staple industries were located.

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1945-1990**13 How far did British power decline from 1945 to 1990?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a wide range of issues that candidates might consider and it is not expected that all will be considered. However, at the higher levels it should be expected that answers will range across the whole period. Candidates might argue that power did not decline and point to Britain's continued presence on the UN Security Council, an independent nuclear deterrent, ability to assert herself militarily in the Falklands and the Gulf. Some may also argue that Britain played an important role in ending the Cold War and the improvement in relations with the USSR. However, this can be balanced against the loss of Empire and the Suez Crisis which suggested a loss of power. It might also be argued that the UK became more reliant on the US or that Britain had to join the EEC because of a decline in power. Some might argue that Britain became a US poodle and point to Grenada or the use of British bases for attacking Libya, earlier in the period Britain had to rely on US money, combine zones in Germany and was unable to deal with Greece without US support.

14 Assess the reasons why Britain's nuclear policy caused controversy from 1945 to 1990.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to be aware of the nuclear policy pursued by Britain in this period. Candidates might consider how far governments were able to establish an independent nuclear deterrent and concerns that she was too closely linked to the US and they might point to the positioning of cruise missiles etc in Britain. The escalating cost of the policy might be considered, particularly as defence policy might be seen to have taken funds from other areas. Candidates might mention that by 1954-5 the cost of rearmament was approaching the levels of the Second World War and as the period progressed there were concerns about bankruptcy. There might be some consideration of the position of the Labour party in the 1980s and the concept of unilateral disarmament. There might also be consideration of the difficulties Britain had in keeping up in the arms race and as a consequence concerns about links with the US. Some might argue that groups wanted to see Britain follow a policy of détente. The development of nuclear weapons might also be linked to discussions about the future role of conventional weapons. There might be discussion of the question of control over the deployment and use of weapons and how much influence Britain would have over the US and this might also be linked to British reliance on US delivery vehicles. There was concern over Polaris, although Kennedy did acknowledge Britain's right to use it independently when 'supreme national interests' were concerned. Discussion of Labour's desire to cut defence spending might be considered and there might also be some consideration of pressure groups such as CND. In particular candidates might consider the 1980s and Labour policy that put the nuclear issue at the centre of their campaign and demanded a non-nuclear Britain. There might also be mention of attitudes towards SDI.

15 How far did the USA influence British foreign policy under Thatcher?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There is much debate about how far British foreign policy was dominated by US interests. Although her first three foreign secretaries have criticised her pro-American policy some have argued that, although unpopular it did the UK no harm. Thatcher believed that it was in Britain's commercial, strategic and security interests and that through this the communist threat could be resisted. However, it can also be argued that she was not prepared to sacrifice what she considered essential UK interests. There was close co-operation over military and intelligence matters and she was able to acquire Trident on generous terms. It might be argued that the Foreign Office thought Thatcher was an American poodle and that this resulted in her being too anti EU and too pro US. It might also be noted that she

was a strong British nationalist and this was seen in the Falklands crisis. However she did support the US attempts to arm the Afghans fighting the Soviets. She was anti-communist and her desire to bring down the Communist states was not influenced by the US, but it was in their interests to work together. However, it should also be noted that her hardline attitude changed once Gorbachev was in power and she entered into dialogue with him. It might be argued that she was a useful bridge between Reagan and Gorbachev. She was keen to open up new relationships with the new states of Eastern Europe and have the EU expand to include them as this was in the UK's interest as they would be a counterweight to France and Germany. In considering her relations with the EU it can be argued that it was British interests that dominated Thatcher's policy.

Post-War Britain 1951-1994**16 How successful was Macmillan as leader of the Conservative party?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might argue that he was successful and point to his 'supermac image' and to his electoral success. He was able to reunite the party after the disasters of Suez and was also able to win electoral popularity and defeat the new Labour leader, Gaitskell, who was popular with the middle classes. The electoral victory in 1959 was the first time a party had won a third consecutive election. However, this might be balanced by consideration of his final years which saw by-elections defeats and scandals. Some candidates might point to his skill in handling the media; he mastered television and understood the importance of addressing his own image in the age of visual media. His personal approval ratings rose dramatically in the first part of the period. He was able to modernise the party election campaigns which paid more attention to opinion polling and modern methods of public relations. He was able to convince the country that they had never had it so good.

17 'The Labour governments from 1964 to 1970 and from 1974 to 1979 failed to solve the economic problems they faced'. How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The period is often seen as one of economic decline that governments failed to reverse. In order to answer the question candidates might identify the economic problems faced and then consider how successful the policies were in addressing the difficulties. The governments faced the problem of shrinking manufacturing industries and a growing financial and service sector. The transition was not smooth and it caused difficult industrial relations. Candidates might consider Labour governments attempts to bring in statutory rules into industrial relations and how successful they were in removing industrial conflict; issues such as the 1966 National Union of Seamen strike might be mentioned. Labour did face problems in dealing with this issue as they did not want to antagonise its chief supporters and this prevented Wilson from persevering with its attempts to outlaw unofficial strikes as laid out in the White Paper of 1969. Candidates might also consider the failure of governments to address the problem of economic growth rates. The difficulties created by the oil price rise of 1973 might be considered as it resulted in a balance of payments deficit, inflation, a decrease in the value of sterling, rising interest rates and unemployment. Some might consider the reliance on loans from the IMF and devaluation of the pound as a sign of failure. It might be argued that if devaluation had been introduced earlier then difficulties could have been reduced. The government also failed to persuade the unions to co-operate consistently with it, despite the repeal of the Conservative Industrial Relations Act. Candidates might also refer to the Winter of Discontent as evidence of failure. However, the failures might be put into context and candidates might suggest that the scale of the problems and their international dimension meant that some issues were outside government control.

18 'Thatcher's economic policies failed to achieve significant economic change.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There is much debate as to how far her policies brought about an economic revolution as there were significant changes in the economy and its management. Candidates might consider some of the following issues: the role of the government in managing the economy as market forces, rather than the government directed it, there was a new economic philosophy of monetarism, inflation was radically lowered, an enterprise culture was introduced, high personal taxation, public spending and borrowing by the government were ended, the role of Trade Unions in the economic life of the country was reduced and huge sections of industry which were owned by the state such as Telecommunications and Electricity were privatised. Answers may discuss how far any of these issues deserve to be considered a revolution as all of the areas have alternative interpretations.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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

GCE

History

Advanced GCE **F962/01**

European and World History Period Studies Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1095-1609

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs and corresponds to the UMS

2 answers: each maximum mark 50.

	A01a	A01b
IA	21-24	24-26
IB	18-20	22-23
II	16-17	19-21
III	14-15	16-18
IV	12-13	13-15
V	9-11	11-12
VI	4-8	6-10
VII	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
Total mark for each question = 50	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: - 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, detailed 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;">21-24</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context • Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed and substantiated explanations, some of which may be unexpected • The argument evaluates a range of relevant factors and reaches clearly substantiated judgements about relative importance and/or links. <p style="text-align: center;">24-26</p>
Level IB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly <p style="text-align: center;">18-20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Answer is mostly consistently and relevantly analytical with mostly developed and substantiated explanations • Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context. • 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. <p style="text-align: center;">22-23</p>
Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic • 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;">16-17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description • The analysis of factors and/ or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages. <p style="text-align: center;">19-21</p>

<p>Level III</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic 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 organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated <p style="text-align: center;">14-15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some/uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context • Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events OR answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin. • Answer considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance or linkages between factors/issues • Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions <p style="text-align: center;">16-18</p>
<p>Level IV</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant. • Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication. <p style="text-align: center;">12-13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory. • Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context. • Answer may be largely descriptive/ narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained OR answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis. • Limited points made about importance/links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions <p style="text-align: center;">13-15</p>
<p>Level V</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some relevant accurate historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material also • Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/ inappropriate use • 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 <p style="text-align: center;">9-11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic • General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Attempts at analysis will be weak or generalised, based on plausible but unsubstantiated points or points with very general or inappropriate substantiation OR there may be a relevant but patchy description of events/developments coupled with judgements that are no more than assertions • There will be some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic not address the focus of the question <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>

<p>Level VI</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy • Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation <p style="text-align: center;">4-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little understanding of key concepts • Very limited understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements • Limited explanation will be very brief/ fragmentary • The answer will be characterised by generalised assertion and/or description/ narratives, often brief <p style="text-align: center;">6-10</p>
<p>Level VII</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and 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"> • No understanding of key concepts or historical developments. • No valid explanations • Typically very brief and very descriptive answer <p style="text-align: center;">0-5</p>

Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1095-1609**The Crusades and Crusader States 1095-1192****1 To what extent was superior military leadership the main reason for the success of the First Crusade?**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue other factors were more significant. In relation to the given factor, candidates may refer to the cooperation that the Crusader princes achieved at key times (eg at Nicaea and Antioch), the generalship of particular leaders (and Bohemond, in particular, may get star treatment here), the overall leadership provided by Adhemar of LePuy, and so on. However, candidates may qualify their discussion of military leadership by referring to the inherent divisions and differences that threatened to jeopardize any success (by discussing, for example, the rivalry between Raymond of Toulouse and Bohemond at Antioch). Such treatment needs to be set in the context of other factors that contribute to any explanation of the First Crusade's success, such as: the divisions and weaknesses of the forces ranged against the Crusade both in Asia Minor and in the Holy Land; the role played by the Emperor Alexius and his aides; the prowess of crusader knights; the unity of religious aim, motivation and sheer determination that was a feature of the crusader army and its rank and file.

2 'The military orders were the main reason for the survival of the Kingdom of Jerusalem.' How far do you agree?

No specific answer is being looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue other factors were more significant. In relation to the given factor, candidates may discuss the origins and purposes of the military orders and the increasingly influential role of the two main orders, Templars and Hospitallers, after the 1130s. They may refer to their garrisoning of key castles and their role in various campaigns and crusades. It would be hard to argue that they did not play a significant role, but candidates may well argue that other factors were more significant. They may refer to: the role played by the Kings of Jerusalem and their various qualities; the role played by the barons; the significance of key conquests along the coast early in its life (under Baldwin) which provided both revenue and a link to the west; the (somewhat sporadic) aid from the West; the significance of major expeditions; the divisions amongst its enemies; the support of the other states; the building of castles and hiring of mercenary forces and so on.

3 Assess the consequences of the Third Crusade.

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to identify a range of results and assess them. This can be done by arguing their relative significance and/or analyzing the short or long term impact. Candidates may well focus on the immediate consequences of the Third Crusade and they can score well if there is assessment of the consequences. They may refer to: the achievements of Richard the Lionheart, the impact on Saladin, the failure to take Jerusalem, the taking of Cyprus and Acre, the restoration of Crusading pride as a result of Richard's victories, the securing of the pilgrim route to Jerusalem, the return of the fragment of the True Cross, the securing of a truce between Christians and Muslims and so on. Candidates are likely to make the judgement that although the Crusade failed in its key objective (the taking of Jerusalem), it cannot be judged a complete failure.

The Renaissance from c. 1400-c. 1500**4 Assess the contribution of any two artists to the development of Renaissance art.**

No specific answer is looked for. It is not possible to write a mark scheme that would cover the influence of the range of Renaissance artists. Whatever artists they choose, candidates must seek to evaluate their significance in the development of Renaissance Art. They are likely to choose, therefore, artists that clearly had some influence and place them in the wider context of the development of Renaissance art. They may, for example, choose an artist such as Massaccio who many claim influenced all artists who followed him, pointing to his use of perspective and the realism of his human figures (expressed in purely human terms of everyday experience). They may refer to his influence on artists such as Fra Angelico and Ucello. They may also refer to Leonardo da Vinci and the influence of his close observation of nature, attention to detail, expression and careful composition. The key to an effective answer is likely to be the quality of a candidate's discussion of exemplar material and their ability to set this in the context of the way Renaissance Art developed. Candidates may seek to compare the contribution of their two artists. Such efforts should be credited but it is not a specific requirement of this question.

5 To what extent was the Renaissance in Venice distinctive?

No specific answer is looked for, but 'To what extent?' must be addressed to score highly. Candidates are likely to discuss both what the Venetian Renaissance had in common with developments elsewhere in Italy and what was unique to it. In their discussion of commonality they may refer to the role of classical influences, the role of patronage and guilds and the influence of artists from Florence and elsewhere. However, they should balance this with discussion of the elements that were essentially Venetian. They may point to Venice's relative independence and isolation from other Italian cities and stress its historic links with the Byzantine Empire. They may discuss Venice's increased significance towards the end of the Renaissance and the role of specific artists from Bellini to Veronese, Titian and Tintoretto in producing art of a distinctive character through its use of light and colour and its sensuality. Byzantine influences may be discussed and the role of the Greek community that gathered there, especially after the fall of Byzantium (there may be reference to El Greco in this context).

6 How important was Erasmus in the development of Christian humanism?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates are likely to argue that Erasmus was the key figure in the development of Christian humanism, but to be convincing candidates must not only deal with Erasmus but also the other influences which led to its development. In discussing the significance of Erasmus, candidates may discuss Erasmus' concern to reconcile new learning with Christianity and his concern to free Christianity from those things which obscured or clouded its truth and purity. They may discuss the significance of his editions of the New Testament and Church fathers, and his more popular satirical works such as his *Adages*, *Familiar Colloquies* and *In Praise of Folly*. They may also discuss his influence on others such as Thomas More and John Colet. Such discussion may be set in the context of other influences on the development of Christian humanism such as the development of Italian humanism (with its emphasis on studying Latin and Greek), the influence of the Brethren of the Common Life and the *Devotio Moderna*, and the work of other individuals such as John Reuchlin and Colet.

Exploration and Discovery c. 1445-c. 1545**7 Assess the reasons why Europeans embarked on voyages of discovery in this period.**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to analyse a range of reasons and assess their significance and/or linkages to score well. Candidates may focus on motivation and discuss some of: the desire to find an alternative route to the spice islands (candidates may address the issue of why at this time?); the desire to find gold (candidates may address the issue of why at this time?); the search for Prester John and other Christian kingdoms; and, the desire for fame and reputation. Candidates may also discuss other reasons such as the context of Ottoman expansion, the Renaissance, the development of relevant technology such as ocean-going shipping such as the caravel and the patronage of princes and nobles. Candidates should support their discussion of reasons with effective explanation and reference to apposite exemplar material.

8 Assess the importance of any two individuals to the development of overseas empires in this period.

No specific answer is looked for. It is not possible to write a mark scheme that would cover the influence of the range of individuals involved in overseas exploration and empire-building. Whatever individuals they choose, candidates must seek to evaluate their importance in the development of empire. That said candidates are likely to focus on the more significant individuals such as Columbus, Cortes, Pizarro, and da Gama. In relation to the last candidates may stress his importance to the development of the Portuguese Empire in India and the spice islands, pointing to his expedition to Calicut and his exploitation of mutual hostility amongst local rulers and the superiority of European firepower. Candidates may see his importance as that of a trail-blazer rather than a systematic conqueror. Candidates may also discuss Cortes' conquest of Mexico between 1519 and 1521 and assess his significance by the extent and thoroughness of his remarkable achievement with just 600 men, sixteen horses, a few small cannon and thirteen muskets in defeating the Aztecs and establishing Spanish control. Candidates may seek to compare the contribution of their two individuals. Such efforts should be credited but it is not a specific requirement of this question.

9 'The impact of Spain on Mexico and Peru was entirely harmful in this period.' How far do you agree?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may well argue that the impact on Mexico and Peru was negative, pointing to the destruction of native civilizations and cultures and the imposition of Spanish and Catholic ways of life. They may also point to the deliberate exploitation of these colonies in the interests of Castile (not least through the extraction of their gold and silver) and the forced labour required of native populations on the settlers' *encomiendas*. Further they may discuss the demographic impact of the arrival of Europeans with their diseases against which natives had little resistance. Candidates may balance such analysis with discussion of possible positives. Mexico and Peru were colonized and settlers wanted to develop their economies and wealth: cash crops like sugar and cotton were developed as were various cereals; European cattle, sheep and horses were introduced and thrived. The Spanish brought with them their systems of government and administration.

Spain 1469-1556**10 Assess the reasons why Isabella was able to consolidate her rule of Castile by 1479.**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may discuss both the winning of the civil war and the measures taken after its conclusion to secure Isabella's position in Castile. In relation to the Civil War candidates may refer to some of the following: securing of the Treasury at Segovia, confirmation of privileges of loyal nobles, attempts to buy support, fortification of key points, conclusion of a truce with the Moors of Granada, peace with Louis XI, the birth of a son, Ferdinand's accession to the throne of Aragon and the use of propaganda. However, they will probably see the Battle of Toro and the subsequent Treaty of Alcaçovas as key. In relation to the consolidation of rule more generally candidates may well discuss the monarchs peripatetic style of rule, measures towards the nobility (threats, pressure, action against key nobles like the Duke of Cadiz, and bribery), the revival of the *Santa Hermandad*, the use of *corregidores*, more efficient collection of taxes and the use of *letrados*.

11 To what extent did Ferdinand and Isabella unify Spain?

No specific answer is looked for. This issue will be familiar to many candidates. Most will probably argue that the claims for unification are relatively slim. Candidates are likely to discuss some of the following in developing their analysis: the separate institutions of Castile and Aragon (they may, for example, point to the failed attempts by Ferdinand to introduce the *Hermandad* into Aragon), the ability of Aragon to maintain its *fueros*, the focus of the monarch's attention on Castile, the separate laws, coinage, economies, the exclusion of Aragon from the New World, unification was not an aim of Ferdinand and Isabella, and so on. On the other hand, candidates may discuss the notion of a Spanish foreign policy and the 'Spanish' nature of some religious policy (the Inquisition's authority ran across Spain). But even in these areas candidates may point to differences (for example, Spain's interest in Italy was derived from Aragon).

12 How successfully had Charles I dealt with the problems he faced by 1524?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to identify problems and evaluate Charles' success in dealing with them by 1524. Success may be evaluated against the historical context, aims and/or results of policies. Candidates are likely to discuss some or all of the following: the *Comuneros* and *Germania* revolts; the tensions between towns and grandees; the power of the nobility; the problem of raising money via the Cortes of Castile, Aragon and other provinces; the privileges of the same; the appointment of ministers; Charles' delay in arriving and his subsequent absence; his other ambitions and commitments (and the use of Spanish resources to pursue them) and so on. Candidates may well argue that after initial difficulties (that created or exacerbated problems) by 1524 Charles had overcome many, but not all. The revolts had been overcome (albeit at great cost in the case of the *Comuneros*), Charles had appointed more Spanish officials, Charles worked with the Cortes to raise taxes, the nobility were excluded from central government but allowed to govern the countryside, a Council of Finance was created, *corregidores* were re-established, and so forth. Candidates may well argue that Charles's success was incomplete as he had to make concessions and the key action was his return to Spain in 1521.

Charles V: International Relations and the Holy Roman Empire 1519-59**13 Assess the reasons why Charles V failed to crush Lutheranism by 1529.**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to identify and analyse a range of reasons and evaluate their relative significance and/or the linkages between them to score well. Candidates may discuss some of the following reasons: Charles' absences; the significance of events surrounding the Diet of Worms; the role of the princes (especially Frederick of Saxony); the social and religious context in which Luther's ideas were spread; the significance of humanism; the printing press; the appeal of Luther's ideas amongst the peasantry and in the cities; the role of von Hutten and so on. Candidates may argue that, despite his desire to crush Lutheranism, Charles V was unable to give the religious crisis in the Empire his close attention (because of absence and other problems) and could not act without the support of the princes. The role of Frederick of Saxony in protecting Luther in the early years may well be emphasized.

14 'Religious conflict enabled the princes to increase their power during the reign of Charles V.' How far do you agree?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may argue for or against the view given. Candidates may discuss the relative power of princes vis à vis the Emperor and point, for example, to the circumstances of the Emperor's election, his acceptance of their privileges and the lack of a standing army with which to enforce his will. They may also argue that Charles V's other commitments made it difficult for him to assert his authority within the Empire and this effectively meant the princes were able to at least hold on to their influence. On the other hand, candidates may argue that these circumstances combined with the problems arising from the spread of Lutheranism enabled them to increase their effective power in the Empire. Certainly Charles could not take action against the Lutherans without the support of the princes (as is demonstrated by the events surrounding the Diet of Augsburg in 1529). However, they may argue that Charles did have one opportunity to assert his authority and weaken the power of the princes and discuss the events surrounding the defeat of the Schmalkaldic League in 1547. On the other hand, they may suggest that the completeness of this victory alienated all the princes and in the end forced him to compromise once more and accept, in the end, the fact of his weak authority and the power of the princes within their own lands.

15 'France was a greater threat to Charles V than the Ottoman Empire.' How far do you agree?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to assess and compare the threats posed by both powers. In relation to the Ottoman threat candidates may point to both the security of the Holy Roman Empire, Austria and Hungary and to security of the Western Mediterranean and Italy. They may discuss the victories of Barbarossa and the Barbary pirates and the advance of the Turks into Hungary and towards Vienna. Both threatened Charles' interests directly (by attacking his possessions) and indirectly (by threatening his communications in the Mediterranean and by distracting him from dealing with other problems such as France and the Reformation). In relation to France candidates may point to the direct threat to northern Spain, the Netherlands, Germany and Charles' interests in Italy. They may make similar points about the impact the Habsburg-Valois conflict had on Charles' ability to deal with other problems. Candidates may also point to the interlinking of these two threats and their occasional attempts to work together against Charles.

Philip II, Spain and the Netherlands, 1556-1609**16 How successful was Philip II's domestic policy in Spain ?**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may address success in relation to the problems Philip faced, what he was trying to achieve and what the results of his policies were. Candidates may discuss some of the following areas: government and administration; relations with the nobility; faction; relations with Castile and the other provinces; finance; religion. In relation to the first, candidates may discuss Philip's style of government and the degree of efficiency/effectiveness in the administration (use of Councils, conflicts, role of the Grand Junta, role of secretaries and key personnel, like Perez). Candidates may discuss Philip's need to cooperate with local nobility and clergy and the role of faction at court. Candidates may also discuss the impact of Philip's centralized system and the exclusion felt by the provinces, a factor in the Aragonese revolt. They may also spend some time discussing the weaknesses of financial administration and the policies adopted to deal with growing expenditure and debt. In relation to the Church and religion, candidates may discuss Philip's counter-Reformation credentials, backing of the Inquisition and policies towards the *moriscos* and heresy.

17 How important was religion in causing revolt in the Netherlands to 1572?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal adequately with the role of religion even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more significant in explaining the outbreak of revolt. In relation to religion candidates may refer to the spread of Protestantism into the Netherlands in the 1550s, Philip's desire to enforce anti-heresy laws, the attempt to impose new bishoprics, the work of the hedge-preachers, the iconoclastic fury of 1566. It was this last that arguably led Philip to decide to use force in the Netherlands. However, candidates may argue that although religion had a role to play, it was other factors that led to revolt. They may discuss the incompatibility of Philip's desire to centralize control and impose uniformity on provinces and nobility jealous of their privileges and status. There may be discussion of the role of William the Silent. They may also refer to the economic and social problems that were also a factor in the mid 60s and the impact of Alva's presence and policies ('Council of Blood', execution of Egmont and Hoorn, and the imposition of the Tenth Penny).

18 Assess the reasons why Spain was unable to crush the revolt of the Netherlands in the 1570s and 1580s.

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to identify and analyse a number of reasons and evaluate their relative significance and/or the linkages between them. Candidates may discuss some of the following: the significance of the Sea Beggars, Alva's actions, the geography of Holland and Zeeland; popular resentment of Spain; the role of William of Orange, army mutinies (Spanish Fury) and shortage of funds; the Union of Utrecht; the roles of England and France; Philip's diversion of resources to deal with other issues (eg Spanish Armada) and his intervention in France. Candidates may argue that the key reasons lay in the different demands made on Philip across Europe and the problems of finance and supply for Spanish forces in the Netherlands on the one hand, and the significance of Dutch particularism, geography and increasingly religion on the other.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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

History

Advanced GCE F962/02

European and World History Period Studies Option B: Modern 1795-2003

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Option B: Modern 1795-2003**Napoleon, France and Europe 1795-1815****1 To what extent did Napoleon's reforms during the Consulate apply the principles of the French Revolution?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may discuss reforms in the government, education, religion and the law in relation to the principles of the French Revolution. They are likely to draw on the principles of popular sovereignty, liberty and equality in the main, though be prepared for the candidate with a more sophisticated view of the French Revolutionary period and its ideas. They are likely to test the Constitutions of the Years VIII and X against the principle of popular sovereignty and are likely to argue that although there were elements of democracy (universal male suffrage, plebiscites, apparently representative institutions) the reality was the creation of a centralised and authoritarian regime. In relation to liberty, the judgement may well be harsh: although there was religious toleration, there was no real freedom of speech or assembly. Candidates may well discuss censorship and other elements of the 'police state'. In relation to equality, there may be a more favourable judgement, pointing to the basic equality of rights that imbues the civil code and the apparent espousal of equality of opportunity (meritocracy); on the other hand, candidates may discuss the unequal treatment of women and workers.

2 To what extent was Napoleon's generalship the main reason for his successes in his military campaigns from 1796 to 1809?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue other factors were more significant. In relation to the given factor, candidates may discuss Napoleon's capacities as a military strategist, campaigner, battlefield general as well as his ability to motivate men, organize his armies and appoint able commanders. In doing so they may refer to specific campaigns (in Italy, Egypt, Marengo, Ulm, Austerlitz, Friedland, Wagram), the development of the corps system and the significance of generals such as Davout and Lannes. In assessing the role of Napoleon's generalship they should set his qualities of generalship against other factors, such as: his position as both ruler of France and Commander-in-chief after he became First Consul; the developments in the French army during the French Revolution as a mass army with revised organization and battle formations (such as the mixed order, re-modelled artillery); the comparative weaknesses of his opponents both in terms of their armies and generals and the failings of the second and third coalitions.

3 Assess the impact of the Continental System on Europe after 1806.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

In assessing impact candidates may discuss the Continental System generally or in relation to specific areas and states, including France. They should display a good knowledge of the aims of the System and how it was put into operation in order to assess its impact. There may be discussion of the role of the Continental System in explaining the Spanish and Russian campaigns. Some candidates may discuss the System in terms of the Continental blockade (i.e. the attempt to exclude British trade from the Continent), but should show awareness that the System was also an attempt to replace Britain with France and make, as necessary, the continent subservient to the economic needs of France. They may well argue that the impact was essentially negative in its economic, social and political effects, referring to such matters as: depriving the continent of key manufactures and exotic goods; distorting patterns of trade; destroying native industries in the interests of protecting French industries (such as Lyons silk industry); producing attempts to subvert the system through smuggling (and the concomitant attempts by the French to police this); the generation of anti-French feeling that helps to explain the growth of opposition and so on.

Monarchy, Republic and Empire: France 1814-1870**4 How successful was Louis XVIII in his rule of France?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may assess success in relation to Louis XVIII's aims, the results of policies and/or the historical context. In relation to the question there may be discussion of the nature of The Charter, the impact of the Hundred Days, the 'White Terror' and Chambre Introuvable, legislation in relation to rights to vote, army reform and press freedom, the payment of the indemnity and the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), Ultras, and so on. Candidates may argue that given the situation in 1814-15, Louis did remarkably well to hold on to power and pass it on his death without incident to Charles X. On the other hand, candidates may suggest that the promise of the early years where he appeared to work within the spirit of the Charter were undermined by the increasing influence of the ultras after the murder of the Duc de Berry in 1820.

5 To what extent were economic and social problems the main reason for the Revolution in February 1848?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more significant. In relation to the given factor candidates may refer to the impact of: the longer term problem of poverty and social unrest; the impact of poor harvests in 1845-6; the international financial crisis from 1846; over-investment in railways; rising unemployment and cutbacks in production. The distress and unrest associated with these developments may be linked to the apparent indifference of the government, the growth of political opposition (liberals, bonapartists, socialists), the desire for reform (Reform Banquets), foreign policy failures and lack of gloire, the lack of will of the monarch and so on.

6 To what extent were Napoleon III's economic and social policies successful?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Success may be assessed by reference to aims, outcomes and context. In relation to social and economic policy, candidates may point to some successes, for example, state stimulus to railway building (fivefold increase in extent) through operating leases and the considerable knock-on effects to other industries (6% p.a. growth in iron, steel and coal) and agriculture (extension of railway network stimulated production for urban markets). They may also point to the promotion of banking and free trade (Chevalier Treaty with Britain) and the work of Haussman in Paris. They may point to the social costs of the last and the divisions over free trade. There are further qualifications to this success (such as the end of the railway boom in the 1860s and the need to rescue *Crédit Mobilier* in 1867) and economic difficulties increased in the late 1860s.

The USA in the 19th Century: Westward Expansion and Civil War 1803-c. 1890**7 How important was mining in opening up the West?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more important. In relation to the mining frontier, candidates are likely to focus on how various mineral discoveries led to 'rushes' of settlement often at the expense of Native Americans. They are likely to discuss the California Gold Rush but many will draw exemplar material more widely to show how different discoveries effectively opened up many different areas to white settlement (from the Georgian Hills in the late 1820s to the Black Hills of Dakota in the 1870s). Candidates may argue that the needs of these mining settlements contributed to the improvements in communication and the involvement of the Federal government that helped open up the West more generally. Candidates may place their discussion of the importance of the mining frontier in the context of other factors that were significant in opening up the West: fur trapping, federal action, the cattle and farming frontiers, improvements in communication and so on.

8 Assess the reasons why westward expansion led to the destruction of Native American society.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to identify and analyse a number of reasons and evaluate their relative importance and/or links. Candidates may discuss reasons such as: the mutual misunderstanding arising from different cultures, the incompatibility of nomad and settler cultures, the destruction of the buffalo on the Plains as they were settled and railways pushed through, the constant westward pressure by a growing white population, the impact of minerals finds and the subsequent 'rushes', the actions of individual commanders in the field, the determination of some Native Americans to fight, the desperation of the Native Americans, the inability of Native Americans to adapt to life on reservations. In discussing some of the above candidates may refer to some of the following developments: the Tecumseh Confederacy, the First Seminole War, Andrew Jackson and the Indian Removal Act of 1830, the Black Hawk War, Second Seminole War, Reservations and the 'trail of tears', the Laramie Treaty, Sand Creek massacre, the Fetterman massacre, the Red River War, Little Big Horn, Wounded Knee.

9 'The strengths of the South's army was the main reason why the Civil War lasted so long.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more important. In relation to the given factor, candidates may discuss the abilities and successes of Confederate generals such as Lee and Jackson, the confidence of the southern soldier (at least at the start of the war) based on his assumption that an agricultural background was better preparation for war than soft city living, the victories of the South in the Virginia theatre between 1861 and 1863 and its continued ability to inflict defeats on the North in 1864 (Wilderness Campaign) and so on. They may set discussion of these in the context of the weaknesses of northern generals like McClellan and Burnside, Lincoln's constant changes in commander-in-chief and his only finding able commanders in Grant and Sherman in 1864. Candidates may also discuss the relative strategic problems facing North and South, the time it took to organize and mobilise the North's superior resources in men and materiel, the long term impact of the 'anaconda' strategy and so forth.

Peace and War: International Relations c. 1890-1941**10 To what extent were the generals to blame for the massive casualties on the Western Front in the First World War?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more significant. They must deal with the issue of 'To what extent?' Candidates may well discuss the reputation of General Haig, and may mention Nivelle and other generals. Candidates may argue that it was the failure of strategic and tactical thinking by generals that led to the mass casualties; such as the decision to order the new volunteer army to advance at a walking pace in line may come under scrutiny. On the other hand candidates may view the approach of German generals at Verdun as one of deliberate mass slaughter. Whatever is said about generals, candidates will need to set their argument in the context of other relevant factors, such as: the state of military technology that favoured a well dug-in defence (artillery, machine guns, barbed wire etc); the mass nature of armies and the ability of both sides to keep the front lines supplied with men and material; the difficulties in achieving surprise because lack of calibration (before 1917) prevented an effective creeping barrage (hence lengthy preliminary bombardments) and so on.

11 Assess the reasons why there were no major wars in the 1920s.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to identify and analyse a range of reasons and evaluate their relative significance and/or links between them. Candidates may well discuss some of the following reasons: military exhaustion after the Great War; the overwhelming desire for peace (at least in Europe) following the mass slaughter ('the war to end all wars'); economic exhaustion and dislocation making war a practical impossibility; the political will to look for peaceful resolution of disputes through the Conference of Ambassadors or through the League of Nations or through negotiated treaties. There may well be discussion of the work and impact of the League of Nations, the Locarno Treaties (and subsequent 'honeymoon'), the Washington Naval Agreement and the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Candidates may argue that those states who may have wanted to reverse the peace treaties (such as Germany) were too weak to do so, or were (like Turkey) able to do so because their opponents lacked the will to resist.

12 Assess the impact of the Great Depression on international relations in Europe in the 1930s.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to identify and analyse the effects of the Great Depression in international relations in Europe and evaluate their relative significance and links between them. Candidates may well discuss the domestic effects of the Great Depression and the influence this exerted on foreign policy. They may argue that in Germany the Great Depression led to the rise of Hitler and his aggressive foreign policy ambitions. They may link such discussion to the divisive effects of the depression on the politics of France and its comparative weakness internationally thereafter, as well as the impact of the depression on Britain and its subsequent desire to avoid international entanglements as it struggled to deal with the effects of the depression domestically and across the Empire. Candidates may draw a direct link between the depression and Britain's policy of Appeasement and desire to avoid war at all costs. This desire to avoid confrontation by Britain and France led to the paralysis of the League of Nations as a peacekeeping body.

From Autocracy to Communism: Russia 1894-1941**13 To what extent was Nicholas II responsible for his own downfall in the revolution of March 1917?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with the issue of the Tsar's responsibility even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more significant. In relation to the Tsar's own culpability, candidates may discuss his failure to learn the lessons of 1905 and make significant reforms, his weakness and indecision, his often poor choice of ministers, his tolerance of Rasputin, his failure to work constructively with the Dumas, his fateful decision to go to the front in 1915 and leave the Tsarina and Rasputin in charge and so on. Such discussion may be balanced by discussion of the longer term problems facing Tsarist Russia, the growth of opposition, the impact of the war, inflation, food shortages, the loss of the support of the army, the crisis of February/March 1917, and so on.

14 To what extent was Trotsky responsible for the victory of the Red Army in the Civil War?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more important. In relation to the given factor, candidates may discuss the organization and leadership of Trotsky. In particular candidates may refer to Trotsky's abilities as a motivator, his morale-boosting use of the railways as he travelled from front to front with propaganda and supplies, his ruthless imposition of discipline, his use of ex-Tsarist officers and his use of conscription. Such discussion needs to be balanced against other factors which may well focus on other relative advantages and strengths of the Bolshevik forces: the central strategic position and control of key transport links and industries, undivided leadership and aims, the relative preference of the peasantry for the 'Reds' over the 'Whites', the quality of generalship relative to the Whites, the size of the Red Army. Candidates may also point to the relative weaknesses of the Whites: the patchwork of opposition to the Bolsheviks, the lack of coordination of efforts, the lack of clear or agreed aims, the resistance of the peasants (and Green forces), the strategic difficulties, the quality of leadership and size of armies, and the ambivalent attitude of the Entente powers despite their presence and supply of arms and so on.

15 'The benefits of Stalin's rule in the 1930s outweighed the costs.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may focus their discussion on collectivization, the five year plans and the degree of political repression. They may refer to Stalin's desire to catch up with the West and destroy capitalist elements in industry and agriculture (and his targeting of Kulaks). In relation to the Five Year Plans candidates may, despite the differences between targets, propaganda claims and achievements, argue that results in terms of production were still impressive. Candidates may also argue that whilst the economic results were impressive the social costs were high with highly controlled and disciplined workers and decline in living standards (at least in the early 1930s). In relation to agriculture, candidates may argue that the forced collectivization had a disastrous impact, at least in the short term, on agricultural production and led to famine in the countryside. They may also stress the social costs of the policy as the Kulaks were eliminated. Candidates may also discuss the aspects of the police state that operated in the 1930s – the lack of freedom and the purges. However, candidates may argue that despite the downsides, Stalin did help to drag the Soviet Union into the modern world.

Democracy and Dictatorship: Italy 1896-1943

- 16 **'Loss of faith in the government was the main effect of the First World War on Italy from 1915.'** How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with the effect identified in the quotation even if they wish to argue other effects were as or more significant. Candidates in developing their answers may discuss the following: the popularity of the decision for war amongst nationalists, if not the population generally; the condemnation of the war by socialists and some liberals; the course of the war with its defeats (esp. Caporetto), hardships and heavy casualties; the impact of defeats on the government; the 'mutilated victory' and nationalist disillusion, the cost of the war both in men and money; inflation and falling living standards; the dislocation of the economy at the end of the war; strikes and rise in union membership; unemployment; rise in support for socialism and fear of socialist revolution, peasant action in the countryside, fascism, disillusion with liberal politicians and their inability to deal with the problems facing Italy, the breakdown of order and so on. Candidates may argue that the loss of faith in the government was a symptom of the other effects of the war with which they were unable to deal effectively.

- 17 **'Mussolini's economic and social policies had only limited success.'** How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to identify and analyse a range of economic and social policies and assess their success. This can be done by measuring the policies against aims, results and/or context. Candidates can be expected to discuss some of the following: education policy and the attempt to indoctrinate the young with fascist ideas (fascist culture and history were compulsory); the role of the *Balilla* and the 'Little Italian Girls'; the *Dopolavoro*; Corporativism; the Battle for Grain; the Battle for Births; the Battle for the Lira; subsidies for industry; the Institute for the Recovery of Industry; the electrification of railways and the building of *autostrade*. Whilst the impact of social policy is not easily measured, candidates may argue that certainly there was a strong attempt to influence young minds, even if literacy rates did not improve markedly. They may also argue that economic policy enjoyed mixed success: corporativism tended to favour employers over workers; the battle for grain distorted the pattern of agriculture; the battle for births achieved only modest increases in birth rates; industry did benefit but Italy remained dependent on the import of raw materials; major railways and motorways were a propaganda success but minor lines and roads were neglected and so on.

18 To what extent did the aims of Mussolini's foreign policy change from 1922 to 1940?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may argue that Mussolini's foreign policy had no clear aims or direction until the mid 1930s beyond some grand aim of restoring Italian prestige. Discussion in relation to the 1920s may refer to the Corfu Incident, the acquisition of Fiume and the Locarno Treaties. They may suggest that Mussolini in this period and up to the early 1930s, whilst seeking to cut a figure on the international stage, sought acceptance by Britain and France and valued a good relationship with them in the hope that they would support his Mediterranean ambitions. Candidates may argue that in the 1930s Mussolini's foreign policy became more assertive and defined, looking for concessions from Britain and France, supporting Austrian independence, and a drive for Empire (Abyssinia). The Abyssinian crisis may be viewed as a turning point – 'success' was qualified by the costs and the loss of British and French friendship. After 1935, increased cooperation (e.g. over involvement in the Spanish Civil War) and alliance with Germany undermined Italy's international prestige and led Italy into a war for which it was unprepared. Candidates may argue therefore that whilst general aims may have remained the same the means to achieve them and the detail of them did change.

The Rise of China 1911-90**19 To what extent were Jiang Jieshi's (Chiang Kai Shek's) domestic policies successful?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Success may be assessed in terms, for example, of aims, outcomes and the historical context. Candidates may discuss some of the following aspects: the establishment of a Nationalist state symbolised by capital at Nanking (but varied extent of authority of Nationalists in areas away from key centres); his failure to deal with communists and forced mutual action against Japan after 1937; comparison with warlord years; lack of democracy and corruption, lack of support; the degree of economic progress (industry, transport) and limited social reform (education, New Life Movement, women); the failure to help peasants; his eventual defeat. Candidates may argue that Jiang's main aims were to hold on to power and to crush the communists and that whilst he did the former until the late 40s, he failed in the latter. However, Jiang and the Nationalists never enjoyed full control of China – any success was relative to the chaos of the warlord years.

20 Assess the reasons for the Cultural Revolution in the 1960s.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to identify and analyse a range of policies and assess their success; this can be done against aims, results and/or historical context. Candidates may discuss some of the following developments: the failure of the Great Leap forward; Mao's retreat from public life, the 'Little Red book' and developing 'cult of personality', the Wu Han affair, divisions in the CCP, role of the PLA, The Group of Five, the Shanghai forum and the Gang of four, The Central Cultural Revolution Group, roles of Lin Biao and Jiang Qing, Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping. Among the reasons for the Cultural Revolution, candidates may discuss the relative merits of: the reaction to the failure of the Great Leap Forward, the desire to remove rivals to Mao and to purge the CCP of 'rightists' and 'bourgeois elements'; the re-emphasis of the peasant revolution and the idea of permanent revolution; the attack on the 'four olds' and the desire to re-create Chinese culture. Candidates may well argue that there were personal reasons for the Cultural Revolution (Mao's suspicion of rivals and desire to rehabilitate himself) as well as concerns over the direction and nature of the Chinese Revolution.

21 'The only significant changes after the death of Mao were economic.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with the issue raised in the quotation even if they wish to argue that there were other changes as or more significant than the economic ones. Candidates may argue that whilst there has been significant development in the economic sphere, there have only been limited moves towards political liberalization - the essential political domination and control of the communist state has remained. In short they may well agree with the quotation. In seeking to assess the significance of economic and other changes, candidates may discuss some of the following: the 'four modernisations' and limited liberalization; the four 'Special Economic Zones' and growth of foreign trade; the significance of Deng Xiaoping and the trial of the Gang of Four; the 'four cardinal principles'; developments in social policy – one-child family; the limited political reforms; the significance of the 'democracy wall' and the 'fifth modernisation'; Tiananmen Square.

Democracy and Dictatorship in Germany 1919-1963**22 'The impact of the Great Depression was the main reason for Hitler's rise to power by January 1933.' How far do you agree?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with the impact of the Great Depression adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more significant. In relation to the Great Depression, candidates may suggest that the devastating collapse of the German economy not only created an atmosphere of despair, but also discredited the fragile Weimar democracy and its moderate parties which failed to respond adequately. They may also suggest that such a situation provided an opportunity for the two main extremist parties opposed to Weimar: the communists and the Nazis. However, they may also argue that it was the skill of the Nazis in exploiting this opportunity that best explains their rise (through their skillful propaganda, playing on people's fear of communism and hopes for a better future, through their apparent 'action' in dealing with Communists on the street, through the charismatic appeal of their leader, Hitler, and so on). In addition they may point the finger at the failure of key political figures like von Papen, Schleicher and Hindenburg.

23 To what extent did the Nazis achieve the aims of their social policies?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to discuss what the Nazis were aiming to do in their social policies and then assess the impact of those policies. Social policies include their policies towards children, education, women, workers and arguably race and the Church. Candidates may discuss some or all of these. Better candidates may discuss the overarching vision of the Nazis of a '*volks-gemeinschaft*', or people's community, the desire to create a population indoctrinated with Nazi ideas that would lay the foundation for the thousand year Reich. Candidates may suggest that Nazi policies may have had the greatest impact on the young and least on the old, and may discuss the impact of particular policies (such as the attempts to encourage women to have children or produce the necessary martial qualities in the young). They may question the success of policies by reference, for example, to the growth of resistance in the young, for example.

24 How successful was Adenauer's foreign policy?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Success may be assessed in terms, for example, of aims, outcomes and the historical context. Candidates may discuss the steps by which West Germany became integrated into Europe, the Schuman Plan and the ECSC, its winning of international recognition, the rearmament problem and the EDC, and its joining of NATO, the ending of the 'Occupation Statute', relations with the Soviet Union and GDR and the 'Hallstein Doctrine', the problem of West Berlin and the Berlin crisis. Candidates may place their discussion of success in the context of relations between France and Germany in relation to economic and military cooperation, and with the USA and the Soviet Union in relation to the centrality of Germany in the Cold War during the 1950s. Overall, candidates are likely to argue that Adenauer's foreign policy must be considered a success, establishing and maintaining West Germany's independence, building relations with France and the Benelux, maintaining the aim of reuniting Germany and so on.

The Cold War in Europe from 1945 to the 1990s

- 25 'America's main aim was to stop the spread of Communism in Europe.' How far do you agree with this view of American foreign policy in Europe from 1945 to 1948?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal adequately with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more significant. In relation to the given factor, candidates may discuss the views of Truman, the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan and the development of American policy in relation to Germany. Candidates may draw on the knowledge of the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, developments in Greece, the moves towards a western military alliance. Candidates may set such discussion in the context of the economic aims of the Marshall Plan and US encouragement of the economic integration of Western Europe (e.g. by reference to the OEEC). Candidates are likely to argue that the economic and political ambitions of the USA were closely linked and that the desire to contain communism was at least as great as the economic interest in aiding West European recovery.

- 26 To what extent did relations between East and West improve in Europe from 1948 to the mid 1980s?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This question seeks to elicit responses that can provide an overview of the period and discuss the changes and developments that occurred between 1948 and the 1980s. Candidates may draw on their knowledge and understanding of issues such as: the Berlin Blockade, NATO, the creation of East and West Germany, Hungary, the Berlin Wall, Détente, the Helsinki Accord and the 'New Cold War'. Candidates may argue that there is no clear pattern of improved relations and that relations were very poor both for most of the 1950s and early 60s and in the early 1980s and that the improvement in relations during the later 1960s was relative rather than decisive, despite Brandt's *Ostpolitik* and the Helsinki Agreement.

- 27 To what extent were economic problems the main reason for the collapse of Soviet power in Eastern Europe?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal adequately with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more significant. In relation to the given factor, candidates may discuss the longer term development of economic strains in the USSR since the mid 1970s when its industrial production began to fail and the technological lead of the West accelerated. The strains on the Soviet economy because of its international commitments, not least the war in Afghanistan also took their toll. Candidates may also refer to the economic motives that resulted in *perestroika* and the encouragement of reform amongst the Soviet Union's allies. Candidates may balance their discussion of economic difficulties by setting them in the context of Gorbachev's reforms: the repudiation of the Brezhnev Doctrine and policies of *perestroika* and *glasnost*, the beginnings of the break-up of the Soviet Union and their implications for/impact on Eastern Europe, pointing to, perhaps, the legalization of Solidarity in Poland along with democratic elections there and in Hungary, followed by the collapse of communist regimes elsewhere. They may also point to the contrast with the wealth and freedom of the West, the growth of dissidence in Eastern Europe and the impact of the Soviet Union's inability to compete militarily with the USA.

Crisis in the Middle East 1948-2003**28 To what extent were the actions of the Zionist movement the main reason for the creation of the state of Israel in 1948?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal adequately with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more significant. In relation to the Zionist movement, candidates may point to the origins of the modern desire for a Palestinian homeland for the Jews (e.g. Herzl and the World Zionist Organisation), the encouragement of Jewish immigration to Palestine during the British Mandate, developing Arab-Zionist tensions, the actions of the Irgun and Stern Gang, Ben Gurion and the Jewish Agency, and fighting with the Arab League. Such discussion may be balanced against other factors such as the attitudes and policies of Britain and the USA, the impact of the Second World War and the Holocaust. Candidates may argue that although the Zionists did much to press for the creation of a Jewish Homeland, their more extremist elements and their attitudes towards Arabs and their terrorist actions made the creation of a Jewish state more difficult and also alienated opinion.

29 How successful was Nasser as leader of Egypt?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Success may be assessed in relation to aims, outcomes and/or historical context. Candidates may discuss both domestic and foreign policies. Candidates in developing their argument may refer to some of the following: Nasser's successful establishment of power in Egypt, consideration of his economic and social reforms, the Aswan Dam, his handling of the Suez Crisis, his relations with America and the Soviet Union, his 'leadership' of the Arab World, the attempted union with Syria (the United Arab Republic), the Six Day War. Candidates may argue that Nasser enjoyed considerable success both at home and abroad, raising the prestige of Egypt and Arab states more generally, and bringing beneficial reforms at home. They may argue that the Six Day War was a disaster for Nasser and Egypt, but that he remained well-respected and was greatly mourned when he died in 1970.

30 Assess the reasons why the Iran-Iraq War (1980-88) lasted so long.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to identify and analyse a range of reasons and evaluate their relative significance and/or linkages. Candidates may draw on their knowledge of the course of the war in developing their argument. They may refer to some of the following: Saddam Hussein's lack of military knowledge or experience, poor planning and strategy and the failure of Iraq's attempted knock-out blow at the start of the war; Iranian counter-offensives, the use of poison gas, the failure of the 'tanker war', western arms supplies to Iraq and less obviously to Iran), Iranian fanaticism and 'human wave' tactics. Apart from the military aspects, candidates may discuss the role of the two leaders, Hussein and Khomeini, the involvement of the international community (CIA providing Iraq with key information, for example), the delay in UN involvement (calls for a cease-fire only came in the seventh year of the war).

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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

History A

Advanced GCE **F963/01**

British History Enquiries. Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1660

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

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

Notes related to Part A:

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

Marking Grid for Question (a)

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Total for each question =30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness. • Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue. • The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately. • Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these. <p style="text-align: center;">15-16</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts. • Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue. • The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly. <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control. • Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made. • Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue. • The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent. <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both. • Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely. <p style="text-align: center;">10-12</p>

Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted. • A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence. • Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it. • Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach. <p style="text-align: center;">8-9</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and /or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion. • Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding. • Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication. <p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit • Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation. <p style="text-align: center;">6-7</p>
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement. • Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context. • Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic. • Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused. <p style="text-align: center;">3-5</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance. • Weak or non existent context with no conceptual understanding. • No structure with extremely weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment. • Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

	A01a and b	AO2a and b
1	20-22	42-48
2	17-19	35-41
3	13-16	28-34
4	9-12	21-27
5	6-8	14-20
6	3-5	7-13
7	0-2	0-6

Notes related to Part B:

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

AOs	A01a and b	A02a and b
<p>Total mark for the question = 70</p>	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
<p>Level 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p style="text-align: center;">20-22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation. • Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer. <p style="text-align: center;">42-48</p>
<p>Level 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p style="text-align: center;">17-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent. • Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">35-41</p>

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

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

1 The Normans in Britain 1066-1100

(a) Study Sources B and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for the strengths of William of Normandy's invading army.

[30]

Both mention knights and archers. Both suggest the Norman army was well organised and that William was there with his troops. **B** says specifically that William could give his orders easily and **C** backs this up when he was able to tell the archers to change their tactics. Both indicate that William was a fine leader, in **B** he had courage and in **C** he led his troops nobly. Both imply that the Normans were likely to win, perhaps because of hindsight.

B is alone in mentioning the powerful support the Normans had from the Pope, while **C** sees the power coming from the fury and force with which the army advanced. **B** indicates that the Norman armour was a great strength, heavily clad footsoldiers, while **C** sees the archers as crucial. **B** has the size and strength of the Normans as decisive but **C** looks at the tactics used. However the strength of his discipline was undermined by the rashness of his footsoldiers.

Both the sources as chroniclers were writing a narrative and selected the events which seemed significant to them. **B** is well known as a pro Norman source but both write favourably of William. The impact in **C** comes very much from the use of adjectives. In terms of judgment **B** may be the better Source given the more precise information given about the army and its proximity to the Norman victors.

(b) Study all the Sources

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that William I's leadership was the main reason for the Norman victory at Hastings.

[30]

Sources **A**, **B**, **C** and **E** are most inclined to suggest that William's qualities were crucial. **B** refers to his courage and the sound disposition of his troops. **A** mentions his tactics whereby he secured his rear by building a castle and took the English by surprise. Both **B** and **D** suggest that he was well placed to give out his orders. **C** refers to his noble bearing and to his change of tactics. On the other hand, **B** indicates that the Church was on William's side, implied with the reference to the Papal banner and possibly in **D** by Harold having killed his brother.

The English had some disadvantages such as the size of their army, from **A** and **D** and the difficulty Harold had in giving orders as explained in **E**. **E** also refers to the lack of archers in the English army because it had been hastily assembled. Candidates are likely to refer to the Battle of Stamford Bridge to underline the weakness of the English and to the long march south. **A** implies that Harold suffered desertion – "those that would stay with him". Source **D** also states this – not many ready "to obey his call" given retention of Norse plunder. **But** Source **A** shows how hard the English fought and candidates could support this from the evidence that the battle lasted all day. They did also have the security of the ridge – Senlac Hill and the shield wall as mentioned in **E** and the picked house carls who fought to the death.

Source **E** argues strongly that the lack of cavalry was a key factor and that the Normans were a more efficient killing machine. Candidates may argue that the decisions taken on the battlefield were responsible for the outcome and William, with his greater experience, his rallying of his troops when they thought he was dead and his exploitation of the Breton retreat was a better leader than Harold, who was foolish in committing to battle before all his troops were assembled.

The sources are mainly pro Norman **B**, **C** and **D** and including the historian in **E**. They downplay Harold's strategic advantage and the power of the shield wall if kept intact. All except **A** are post-1070, 2 are 12th century, and assume a Norman viewpoint. **A** gives Harold credit for challenging William and for fighting fiercely and bravely with many loyal

companions. Nonetheless **D**'s evidence on the impact of the Battle of Stamford Bridge is telling and could be used to argue that Harold's weakness was more important than William's leadership in achieving victory at Hastings.

UCLES

2 Mid-Tudor Crises 1536-1569
Social and Economic Change 1536-1558

- (a) Study Sources A and B**
Compare these Sources as evidence for the problems facing the poor between 1536 and 1550. [30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The Sources **agree** that the poor are lacking food. Source **A** says they are 'in need of meat' and Source **B** says they 'starve and die'. The Sources agree that the poor no longer receive charity and they also agree that there is no hospitality for travellers. They also agree that profits of the land no longer benefit the poor, as in Source **A** they go to the King, rather than the abbeys who used the profits to pay their servants, and in Source **B** the profits go into the pockets of the greedy enclosing landlords who 'have no pity for the poor' and merely 'seek their own profit'. They both agree on 'decay of the commonwealth'. Both Sources refer to unemployment. In Source **A** tenants 'do not know how to make a living' whereas in Source **B** they are no longer able to keep a cow to feed their family. Source **A** refers to the loss of tenancies and Source **B** to loss of common pastures.

But the Sources also **disagree**. Source **A** takes a positive view towards the abbeys and sees them as supporters of the poor. It refers to poor communications due to highways and bridges not being maintained by the abbeys and the loss of the beautiful buildings. Source **B**, on the other hand, concentrates on the effects on the poor of enclosure for sheep farming, which has caused evictions, depopulation and inflation. Food prices have reached a peak, especially those connected with sheep farming, to maintain profits of capitalist landlords. The monks displaced by the dissolution of the monasteries in Source **A** have been replaced by greedy landlords whom the author states are behaving like monks.

The **provenance** of the Sources may be used to determine which is more useful or reliable for explaining the problems facing the poor. Both Sources are subjective and reflect their context. The key aspect for comparison is their purpose. The author of Source **A** is Robert Aske, who is under interrogation as leader of the Pilgrimage of Grace rebellion in Yorkshire a few months earlier. He might be trying to justify his actions and receive clemency, by drawing the king's attention to the grievances of poor people who have no political voice. The author of Source **B** is a servant of Somerset, supporting his patron's view that economic problems are the fault of greedy enclosing landlords rather than the policy of Somerset's government.

Aske, the author of Source **A**, is a Catholic, wishing to restore the monasteries which he sees as 'commendably serving God', whereas the author of Source **B** is a Protestant chaplain who condemns the gentry as behaving like corrupt monks.

The **context** of the two Sources has some points of similarity, in that both are written at a time of social unrest, but whereas Source **A** sees the change of land ownership from the church to the king due to the start of the dissolution of the monasteries and the recent Break with Rome, Source **B** sees the longer term effects of the loss of monastic welfare for the poor. It also reflects the impact of the sale of those same lands to the capitalist gentry, which includes enclosure, rack-renting, food shortages, unemployment and evictions. At the time of Source **B** wars have also led to the debasement of the coinage and inflation.

A supported judgement should be reached on the relative value of the Sources as evidence. Source **A** focuses narrowly on the impact of the dissolution, but is useful as

evidence for this, whereas Source **B** has a broader view of wider problems and of long term effects of royal policy, especially the sale of monastic land to capitalist gentry. Source **A** might exaggerate the impact of the dissolution to justify rebellion. The purpose of Source **B**, to attribute blame, also undermines its value as evidence, though it is very useful for the effects of enclosure. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.

(b) Study all the Sources.

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Tudor government policy was the main cause of social and economic problems between 1536 and 1558. [70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The Sources contain references to different interpretations, so they may be grouped according to their view. The **supporting** view is shown predominantly in Sources **A**, **C** and **E**, whereas the **opposing** view features in Sources **D**, **B** and to an extent in **C**.

The **supporting** view in Sources **A** and **C** is that Tudor governments followed economic policies which caused social and economic problems, such as sale of church land to the gentry and a 'humanitarian' anti-enclosure policy, both of which encouraged riots and rebellion. This may be evaluated by reference to knowledge of other non-humanitarian policies such as a harsh Vagrancy Act of 1547 and the repeal of treason and heresy laws which took the lid off pent up grievances and allowed extremists to gain support. Source **E** adds that successive governments after 1542 also debased the coinage and followed mercantile policies which undermined English trade. Source **E** refers to licences granted to foreign merchants to the detriment of English subjects. Source **E** also refers to the impact of an aggressive foreign policy, with wars against Scotland and France which brought a serious national debt.

The Sources also support the **opposing** view. Source **B** places the blame for social and economic problems on greedy capitalist landlords enclosing pasture for sheep farming. Knowledge of slumps in the wool trade and the collapse of Antwerp might be used to evaluate this point. Rioters are blamed for making the problem worse in Source **C** after taking matters into their own hands despite the government trying its best to deal with the situation by humanitarian anti-enclosure commissions. The title of Source **C**, a proclamation 'Pardoning Enclosure Rioters', reveals the weakness of Somerset's government in dealing with unrest. Knowledge of the local economic grievances which led to Kett's Rebellion might be used in evaluation. Source **D** takes a different line, suggesting natural disasters are another cause of the problems, which was beyond the control of the government. It reveals the impact of bad weather and epidemics in causing food shortages, wastage of arable land and famine. In contrast to the unemployment cited in Sources **A** and **B**, a shortage of labour is given as a problem in Source **D**. Knowledge of population change might be used in evaluation.

The **provenance** of the Sources should be integrated into the discussion. The purpose of the Sources may be discussed. In Source **A**, Aske may be trying to justify his leadership of the Pilgrimage of Grace. In Source **B**, Becon's Protestant bias against the monks is evident, and as a Somerset sympathiser, he may be trying to justify Somerset's government and exonerate it from blame for increasing economic instability. The fact that Somerset acts by proclamation in Source **C** rather than legislation reveals the weakness of government policy. The tone of Somerset's proclamation, 'by the advice of his said dear

uncle', suggests that he is trying to deflect blame from himself for a failed policy of anti-enclosure commissions, 'His Majesty set up'. In the context of a royal minority, it is unconvincing that he is merely following the wishes of the King, not acting on his own behalf. Source **D** is from a later biography of Thomas Cranmer written by a Protestant preacher, who possibly might see the natural disasters of the reign of Mary as judgement for the martyrdom of Cranmer. In Source **E** Sir Thomas Gresham is an economist who desires to become an adviser of the new monarch on her accession. By looking back at the Mid-Tudor period he wishes to serve the interests of his merchant class by identifying financial policies which the Queen should follow to benefit them as well as the country.

Supported overall **judgement** should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation that government policy caused the social and economic problems mentioned. No specific judgement is expected.

Candidates are likely to consider a range of government policies within the Sources: religious changes, sale of crown lands, anti-enclosure commissions, the use of proclamations, debasement of the coinage and trading regulations. They are likely to set the Sources within the context of strong or weak monarchies, perhaps due to age or gender. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.

3 The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637-1660 The Outbreak of the First Civil War

(a) Study Sources C and D

Compare these sources as evidence for attempts to rally support in June 1642. [30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The **provenance** of the Sources should be integrated into the comparison. Context is useful in explaining the different arguments used in attempts to rally support. A very significant issue is that the basis of Source **A** is the Commission of Array and that of Source **C** is the Militia Ordinance. Parliament had passed the Militia Ordinance in March 1642 to give them the right to raise troops to protect England. This was not an Act of Parliament in the absence of the King's signature. They claimed that the King was intending to use the army in Ireland against English Protestants. The King therefore felt compelled to revive the medieval Commission of Array in an attempt to rally support for England's protection. The purpose of the two Sources is **similar** in that both King and Parliament are rallying military support for their cause.

The King sets out his aims to gain support to defend his 'person, honour and just prerogatives' and likewise Parliament's cause is to 'uphold the power and rights of Parliament'. Both Sources claim to be defending 'the laws of the land' and 'personal liberty' in Source **C**; 'laws and freedom' in Source **D**. Charles in Source **C** adds that he 'shall never enforce his prerogative above the law', showing that this is one of the charges made against him by his enemies. This statement might be evaluated in light of the stripping of his prerogative powers by the Long Parliament. Both Sources claim to 'defend the Protestant faith': Charles, in Source **C**, stating his 'daily zeal for the protestant faith' and Parliament stating that those supporting Lords and Commons will 'show their love for the Protestant religion'. But there is a subtle difference here. Charles is referring to the defence of the church and state against the threat of 'separatists' who 'act unlawfully by spreading new doctrines.', whereas Parliament has support among those very sects.

So the Sources are also **different**, first of all in their nature and cause. In Source **C** the King sets out his aims to gain support to defend his person, honour and just prerogatives in a royal declaration, whereas in Source **D** Parliament issue a pamphlet to maintain their power and rights. In Source **D** Parliament claims to be 'serving the nation', thus addressing a broad audience in a published pamphlet. On the other hand, Charles, in Source **C**, promises all his subjects 'full personal liberty and property rights', showing the different audience he is appealing to, face to face, outside York: a more limited assembly of the propertied classes in a traditionally Catholic area of the country. He focuses on the concerns of his conservative audience by stressing his regret that 'separatists act unlawfully by spreading new doctrines to disturb church and state'.

On the contrary, Parliament state the reason for their need to rally troops is that 'the king, led on by wicked advice, intends to make war against his Parliament'. They maintain they are not against the King but his advisors who have misled him. It seems that Parliament distrusts its opponents. Source **D** refers to 'rebellious persons who are pretending to serve the King' offering rewards and promotion to those who join up'. There is no hint of this in Source **C**, where the King appeals for protection against those 'disturbing church and state'. The implication in the King's declaration, Source **C**, is that separatists will endanger freedom and property rights, whereas Parliament, in Source **D**, suggests that the 'king is pretending he needs his own guard' in order 'to call together great numbers' of armed men. The purpose of Parliament is to attract not only men but funding, weapons, horses and horsemen. Context might be used to explain that many of those attracted to the Parliamentary cause may be of a lower economic status than those to whom the King appeals. This is shown by the statement in Source **D** that they need to 'maintain horses, horsemen and arms' suggesting they do not yet have cavalry, unlike the Royalists.

The message differs, as Source **C** appeals for support for a religious and political cause, whereas Source **D** requests funds and supplies. Source **C** is a response to the Militia Ordinance, and Source **D** a response to the Commission of Array. Their value as evidence therefore differs. Source **D** attributes guilt, that the King intends to wage war against his people, whereas Source **C** blames separatists for spreading new doctrines. Thus in tone and opinion, Source **D** might be seen as more useful as evidence in rallying support. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.

(b) Study all the Sources.

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that a dispute over control of the militia was the main reason for the outbreak of the First Civil War in 1642. [70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Parliament interprets the King's action in Source **C** as a cause for military protection, which they had enabled by the passing of the Militia Ordinance. On the other hand, this was seen by Charles as a breach of his prerogative and exposing him to attack.

The Sources contain references to the interpretation in the question, but also to religion and political power, so they may be grouped view by view. The **supporting** view, that control of the militia was the main reason, is shown predominantly in Sources **B**, **C** and **D** and to a lesser extent in Source **E**, whereas Source **A** links military factors with religion and the **opposing** views on the significance of religion and political power feature to varying extents in all the Sources.

The **supporting** view, that the militia was the main reason for the outbreak of first Civil War, is shown by cross-referencing **A** with **B**, to explain why Parliament passed the Militia Ordinance in March 1642. However, the reliability of Source A might be evaluated. O'Neale's claim to have had a Commission from the King seems extremely unreliable, and there was no precedent. Its provenance, the author being the leader of the Irish Rebellion and his purpose, to justify himself, might cast doubt on its authenticity. Its ambiguous references to 'the said kingdom' and 'the same kingdom' might be evaluated in the light of Parliament's comments, in Source **B**, on the 'fears of similar rebellion in this kingdom', 'bloody counsels' and in Source **D** 'led on by wicked advice'. Own knowledge might include the execution of Strafford, where the same fear arose. The link between the Irish Rebellion and the 'most dangerous and desperate attack on the House of Commons', the Arrest of the Five Members, supplied from own knowledge, should aid balanced analysis and evaluation of the Militia Ordinance as a reason for the outbreak of the first Civil War. Charles I himself, in Source **E**, suggests that the dispute over control of the militia was a major reason 'They confessed that the militia was mine, but they thought it fit to have it from me', but the provenance is important here: Charles is about to be executed for waging war on his people and his purpose is to exonerate himself and appear a 'martyr of the people'. He blames Parliament for the outbreak of the first Civil War: 'They began on me', with the supporting evidence being 'the dates of their commissions and mine'. Sources **B** and **C** do show that Parliament began to arm in March, whereas his Commissions of Array followed in June.

This links to an **opposing** view, that political power and prerogatives were also a major reason for the outbreak of the first Civil War. One of the fundamental issues in Source **B** is the political power which enabled control of the militia: 'power to call all those fit to fight in war, train, arm, exercise and muster them. Here it is claimed by Parliament: 'those refusing to obey shall answer to Parliament.' In Source **D** also, the cause is to 'uphold the power and rights of Parliament'. However, the King, in Source **E**, states that 'they confessed that the militia was mine, but they thought it fit to have it from me', so he felt they were usurping his remaining royal prerogative. There may be discussion of defence of the law from those who wish to overturn it. Source **C** suggests the King's main causes in rallying support are defence of his person, prerogative and power. Whereas, in Source **D**, Parliament claims that the King 'intends to make war against his Parliament', in Source **E**, the King claims 'I never began a war with Parliament, nor intended to encroach upon their privileges. The two sides interpreted the situation very differently, and there may be evaluation of which view is the more convincing in the light of provenance, reliability and context.

Another **opposing** view concerns religion. Source **B** refers to the 'bloody counsel of Papists' which shocked Parliament into defending themselves with the Militia Ordinance, linking to Source **A** where the Irish rebels aim to 'seize the goods, estates and persons of all the English Protestants', thus contradicting the King's claims to protect property and rights but also stirring religious war and challenging the church. Yet in Source **E** and **C**, the King claims that God's church has come under attack by radical Protestants and that there is a need for all views to be expressed freely and openly. He suggests in Source **C** that 'separatists act unlawfully by spreading new doctrines to disturb church' causing the outbreak of the first Civil War. He claims to have wished to remedy this dispute with a 'national synod freely called', 'regulating his Church, according to Scripture'. Own knowledge might be used briefly to evaluate the religious intentions of the two sides at the outbreak of war, and judge which view is more convincing.

A supported overall **judgement** should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation that a dispute over control of the militia was the main reason for the outbreak of the First Civil War in 1642. No specific judgement is expected.

Candidates are likely to consider a range of themes within the Sources: control of the militia, political power and prerogatives, the church and perhaps defence of the law. They

are likely to set the Sources within the context of events such as the Irish Rebellion and the Arrest of the Five Members. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.

UCLES

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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 2010



History A

Advanced GCE **F963/02**

Option B Modern 1815-1945

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

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

Notes related to Part A:

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

Marking Grid for Question (a)

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Total for each question =30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness. • Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue. • The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately. • Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these. <p style="text-align: center;">15-16</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts. • Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue. • The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly. <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control. • Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made. • Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue. • The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent. <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both. • Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely. <p style="text-align: center;">10-12</p>

Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted. • A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence. • Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it. • Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach. <p style="text-align: center;">8-9</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and /or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion. • Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding. • Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication. <p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit • Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation. <p style="text-align: center;">6-7</p>
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement. • Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context. • Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic. • Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused. <p style="text-align: center;">3-5</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance. • Weak or non existent context with no conceptual understanding. • No structure with extremely weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment. • Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

	A01a and b	AO2a and b
1	20-22	42-48
2	17-19	35-41
3	13-16	28-34
4	9-12	21-27
5	6-8	14-20
6	3-5	7-13
7	0-2	0-6

Notes related to Part B:

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

AOs	A01a and b	A02a and b
<p>Total mark for the question = 70</p>	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
<p>Level 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p style="text-align: center;">20-22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation. • Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer. <p style="text-align: center;">42-48</p>
<p>Level 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p style="text-align: center;">17-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent. • Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">35-41</p>

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

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

1 The Condition of England 1815-1853

(a) Study Sources B and D

Compare these sources as evidence for the causes of the Plug Plot disturbances in 1842.

[30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both Sources agree that the reduction of wages would appear to have been the trigger and that it would seem that that this was done deliberately by employers. They also stress that others encouraged workers to strike and disturb the peace for their own ends. This is especially elaborated on by Cooper in **D**. They **differ** on the reasons why wages were reduced. The magazine in **B** hints at a general 'intention' to do this quickly, presumably as part of an employer reaction to the great Victorian Depression (1842 was the worst year of the 19th century). The need would be to reduce labour costs. **B** also lays the blame on the Chartists, to be expected from a new magazine anxious to appeal to the wealthy and to stress their command of northern topics. It identifies a 'spreading organisation of a most formidable' type, but it also adopts a dim view of the Anti Corn Law League. In contrast Source **D**, Cooper, blames the Anti Corn Law League, who, it claims, deliberately encouraged employers to pick a strike to paralyse the government and assist their case for the repeal of the Corn Laws. Source **B** also stresses poverty, hence the references to plundering (clothes from workhouses and food from shops). Source **D** introduces drunkenness and the Charter ("Strike for the Charter").

In part the similarities are explained by the date, 1842, a year of exceptional depression and poverty. However the Illustrated News (**B**), a contemporary source, takes a more propertied view, blaming radical organisations for stirring things up to satisfy their own ends. Source **D** is a Chartist source written by a key witness and participant in the event. It places the blame elsewhere, on employers, on drunken workers and the depression. Cooper takes care to stress drunkenness because he was almost immediately held responsible, with others, for the Pottery disturbances. As a radical Chartist speaker he was imprisoned. In his memoirs he may have wanted to clear himself, particularly as he later withdrew from radicalism and repented for a misspent youth. He claims that he was ashamed of the actions of those who destroyed property and broke the law. In practice he may have encouraged disturbance and be one of those members of Source **B**'s 'spreading organisation'. He certainly blamed the Anti Corn Law League.

Both are useful for the different perspectives. It is difficult to verify the sources of **B**'s information and it is certainly generalised. Its respectable perspective ensures Chartist and League blame but it does sympathise with the poor. Cooper in contrast was a participant and potentially the more informative but his memoirs portray reticence on his own involvement in physical force.

(b) Study all the Sources

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the sources support the interpretation that force and provocation were tactics more used by the authorities and employers than the Chartists.

[70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set response is expected.

The sources may be used in a variety of ways to assess the relative use of force in the Chartist period. Only Source **A**, Thomas Dunning, unequivocally comments on state

violence and force. The other four sources can bear different interpretations. However when discussing Chartist physical force it is worth remembering that whilst four of the sources are from Chartist participants all are memoirs, often written long after Chartist collapse in a less violent and more reforming age. Three of these four represent moral force Chartism, Gammage in **C** particularly so. Only Cooper was identified with physical force in 1842 and by the time he wrote his memoir he had long changed his mind. All are likely to play down Chartist violence yet play up O'Connor's provocative stance, although Adams in **E** admits that this was more self delusional than forceful in practice.

Nonetheless the **argument that Chartists used force and provocation** as a tactic can be found in **Sources B, D and E**. Riots are mentioned in the magazine (**B**), with hints of trained 'discipline' and the possibility of 'rebellion'. Gammage in **C** refers disparagingly to O'Connor's provocative demagoguery and posturing that own knowledge can link to threats of physical force ('peacefully if we may, forcefully if we must'). However Gammage is also at pains to point out that other chartist organisations, notably the London Working Men's Association, disclaimed physical force. There is a convincing argument that the Chartists avoided force whenever possible, knowing its potential for harming the cause, as Cooper reminds his audience outside the Crown in Source **D**. Adams in **E** corroborates Gammage's view on O'Connor provocations with his comments on 'denunciations', 'rabble rousing' and regal 'delusions', something which his republican sympathies would find uncongenial. As noted, only Cooper in **D** fully describes one of the two main physical force moments in Chartism, the Plug Plots of 1842. The other moment, the Newport Rising in 1839 may have had hopes of triggering a wider rising but was localised and the jury remains out on who was responsible for the shooting. Cooper refers to a 'wild general strike' which wasn't necessarily 'physical'. The evidence in the Potteries is muddled by Cooper's subsequent arrest and trial, but it would seem from this account that much of the force was random, disorganised and focused on the destruction of property. From hindsight he clearly disapproves. The magazine in **B** also refers to plundering. Own knowledge might refer to the violent and physical force language used, the reports of military drilling, the intimidating tactics of large scale meetings and the occasional surfacing of weapons.

Three of the sources contain strong **suggestions that the authorities and employers used force and provocation** on every possible occasion (**A, B, and D**). In **B** we are told that the employers reduced wages without notice and troops 'poured into the disturbed districts' during the Plug disturbances, a fact confirmed by Cooper in **D** who refers to employers who, for their own ACLL ends, provoked workers whilst cavalry and artillery were deployed by the authorities. Own knowledge may mention the use of the new railways enabling troops from other areas to be deployed quickly. Source **A**, Dunning, is however the strongest evidence for forceful tactics by the authorities. He refers to persecution and imprisonment, a long standing tactic used by governments to take dangerous radicals out of circulation and starve them of the oxygen of publicity. A series of mock trials were held and, on grounds of sedition, radicals were sentenced to a couple of years in gaol. Dunning cites precise numbers (93) and provides effective commentary given his legal role in challenging the evidence in these trials (and his success in 1834 in defending some trade unionists). He is well aware of the pressure brought to bear in Court (the weapons on constant display to remind juries of a Chartist threat of force). The fate of Cooper in 1842 (**D**) and of all the Chartist leadership, including moral force leaders like Lovett, supports this. During the Chartist Petitions and especially at Kennington Common in 1848 the government was armed to the teeth, using the tactic of special constables sworn in for an auxiliary role. Although Dunning's memoirs were written at the very end of a long life he clearly kept records and writes of the cruel conviction of all governments.

2 The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-1886**(a) Study Sources C and E**

Compare these sources as evidence for the attitudes of those who opposed British imperial expansion. [30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the sources 'as evidence for...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both sources **C** and **E** **agree** that there was resistance to expansion although their attitudes are different, as is the type of resistance they are discussing (from Afghans in **C** and Egyptians in **E**). Both are from a western, British viewpoint and stress in **C** a sense of 'freedom' (Gladstone) and in **E** (Churchill) a sense of nationhood (Arabi as 'the movement of the nation'). Both agree that the opposition is righteous ('naturally and not wrongfully' in **C**; 'we should have approved their action' in **E**) and they agree that Britain has wrongfully oppressed opposition. Their tone is remarkably similar – to Gladstone such oppression is 'horrible', to Churchill it is 'devastation', 'struggling wretches' and the 'mess of oppression'. They both condemn British military expansion and intervention and sympathise with the attitudes of those who resisted.

They **differ** in that Gladstone in **C** is discussing the Afghan attitude to British political methods (the Indian model of establishing British Residents as Trojan Horses, hence the Afghan opposition to Disraeli, Carnarvon, and Lytton's proposal for a Resident at Kabul to counter Russian influence) whereas Churchill in **E** is discussing fiscal infiltration. He objects to the entrapment of the Egyptians via debt and the crippling interest rates incurred through spendthrift rulers. However Gladstone would not have agreed with Churchill's point on the legitimacy of Egyptian debt repudiation. The flouting of fiscal rectitude was not, in his eyes, to be equated with the unwarranted destruction of Afghan hill villages. The bombardment of Alexandria was legitimate; burning and subsequent death in the Afghan snow was not.

In terms of **provenance** Gladstone (**C**) is speaking in an election campaign to denounce the forward Imperialism of Beaconsfieldism, using emotive language in the wake of disasters in both South Africa and Afghanistan. Its purpose is to see the Afghans in the same light as one would one's own and to rally popular emotion behind one of the great campaigns of modern political history. Churchill in **E** is, similarly, a political and public speech, 3 years later, in an area that was part of the Midlothian constituency that Gladstone won from a Conservative landowner. He is concerned to stress the hypocrisy of Gladstone, now Liberal PM., who had justified his decision to bombard Alexandria, having condemned Disraeli for retaliating against the Afghan Amir. Interestingly Churchill was a Conservative but he condemns both Tory and Liberal for pursuing illegitimate ends. His angle is the political outsider keen to make an impression within Conservatism and to pressurise his leader, Lord Salisbury. Identifying with the deceased Disraeli he cannot resist having a go at Gladstone. Both are partisan sources, neither especially balanced, but a case could be made for Churchill as the more useful source, unless one sees Gladstone as more typical in the attitudes of those who opposed imperial expansion. Both sense the attitude of those on the receiving end, as well as opponents at home, and both are useful for gauging public opinion given their attempts to mould it.

- (b) **Study all the Sources**
Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that there was little difference between the Imperial policies of Gladstone and Disraeli. [70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

D, E and parts of Sources A and B contain evidence that Imperial policy differed little in practice. Given that **D and E** come from opposite political ends (Gladstone and Churchill) one might consider them effective evidence on continuity but **D** is Gladstone in office as PM and this is an official diplomatic offer to Kruger continuing the pursuit of Confederation. It is not necessarily his personal opinion or policy and indeed we are told that the advice came from the Colonial Office. Nonetheless Gladstone did not challenge it. Churchill is making a point about the similarity of intervention under both men, whether it is Afghanistan or Egypt, but his view is that of the outsider and his agenda might be suspect. Perhaps better evidence is **parts of A and B**, both public statements of Gladstone and Disraeli whilst in opposition (and therefore more reliable, or simply more suspect in terms of point scoring?). Interestingly, in **A**, Disraeli condemns Gladstone's Liberal moves whilst PM on Imperial **Confederation**, although he acknowledges that he has no objection provided the terms were right. The bounds of empire have become too loose. Yet later, whilst PM, Disraeli encourages Frere in Cape Colony to pursue a South African Confederation along Canadian lines, which led to disaster with the Zulus. In **D** Gladstone, at the instigation of the Colonial Office, is prepared to continue with Confederation and attempts to persuade Kruger to accept British Sovereignty (it cannot be given up). Again, as the introduction indicates, it led to disaster (the First Boer war) and the policy was abandoned in the Convention of Pretoria (which acknowledged the Transvaal's independence, saving some vague fig leaf on suzerainty). On the issue of Confederation there would seem to be continuity. There is also evidence of a policy of **forceful intervention** by both when challenged. Source **C** demonstrates Disraeli's apparent use of force to woo the Amir (knowledge might suggest he was reluctantly dragged into it by Lytton) whilst Source **E** shows Gladstone's use of force in Egypt to preserve financial stability in the Canal zone, perceived as a vital British interest since Disraeli's Purchase in 1875. However both sources come from the mouths of opponents, although the fact of military and naval intervention cannot be disputed. Both justified it, but on very different grounds. In **A and B** both agree on a '**mighty mission**'.

The alternative view, that there was a considerable difference in imperial policy between them, can be found in Sources A, B and C. Sources **A and B** establish the key public difference between the two men and both are classic statements of their kind. However both are written whilst in opposition, keen to establish clear blue water between them. Each uses the Empire as a stick to beat the other. Thus **Disraeli in A** accuses the Gladstone government of a plot to dismember the empire using the means of unfettered Confederation. He accuses Gladstone of fiscal meanness, throwing away our greatest asset to save money and reduce taxes to buy further power. There may be some truth in this as Gladstone notoriously economised with both army and navy. On the other hand **Gladstone in B** accuses Disraeli of needless and reckless expansion regardless of British interests and of the means to pay for it (no 'men or money to sustain it'). A clear difference emerges on Imperialism. For Gladstone the Empire is a Pax Britannica with Britain as its core, setting an example by justice, reform and improvement. Welfare and peace are the key, even to the extent of 'friendly independence'. Knowledge would suggest this to be the case given Gladstone's reluctance to intervene and his Confederation policy in Canada and South Africa in the first and second ministries, (**Source D** refers to the Transvaal having 'the fullest liberty to manage their local affairs', although this was 'to be without prejudice to the rest of the population', a reference to continued antagonism with the

Zulus). However for Disraeli the Empire is the 'Empire of England', to be based on a keen sense of national interest, (such as imperial tariffs - although he never attempted anything like this whilst in power). It implied he would spend money (although in power he too was reluctant to incur expenditure). Gladstone maintained in **B** that Disraeli also desired territorial acquisition, which candidates might dispute in practice. Certainly the Empire increased more in size under Gladstone than under Disraeli. As to Disraeli's supposed propensity to use force Gladstone also resorted to it, albeit reluctantly. **Source C** also underlines the differences, but it too is produced in opposition, part of one of the great political campaigns to win an election on the basis of an opponent's immoral and forward imperialism. Its tone is sincere but emotional. The sources certainly support a rhetorical difference but they are less certain in their evidence and provenance as to practice.

**3 England and a New Century 1900-1924
Post War Problems 1918 to 1924**

- (a) Study Sources B and C**
Compare these Sources as evidence for views on government spending on social problems during the immediate post war period. [30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation, and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

There are obvious differences in the **content** of the two sources. **Source B** supports government spending, particularly on housing and legislation on industry, as a means of reducing the danger of revolution. But, in **Source C** the focus of the Geddes Report is on shortage of money, although the committee does suggest greater efficiencies as well as cuts in government expenditure. **Source B** is mainly concerned with housing, urban renewal and working hours. But it also urges improvements in industry, particularly where working conditions are concerned. **Source C** has wider economic and financial concerns within a particular remit, and seems to regard social conditions as a lower priority. However a close reading reveals that this extract focuses more on savings than cuts per se. Health programmes are considered to have merit. **Both sources** reflect a background of post war social and economic difficulty.

In terms of **provenance**, the two years between the dates of the sources reflect a radical change in the situation. By 1922, the Coalition Government is no longer able to provide large sums of money for housing, and other social reforms. In **Source B**, Tom Jones (a close friend, as well as an adviser) would expect the Prime Minister to respond positively. Lloyd George had promised "Homes for heroes" in the run up to the 1918 Election. He has already supported the setting up of the Whitley Councils, bodies which represented both managers and workers in the main industries. Jones sounds optimistic and clearly goes beyond a civil service remit to endorse a progressive Liberal agenda when Lloyd George was at the height of his power. Lloyd George, already known for his energy as a war time leader, is in a strong position at this time. However, by the time of the Geddes Report (**Source C**), economic problems and trade union militancy have weakened Lloyd George's position. Right wing opinion (the Committee is composed entirely of business men and financiers) favours retrenchment to avoid tax increases on business. Less sympathy is shown here for working class interests. Lloyd George, having set up the Committee himself, will be forced to agree to massive cuts in social expenditure.

- (b) Study all the Sources.**
Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the Labour Party was better placed than its rivals to deal with Britain's post war problems 1918-1924. [30]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge, and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses and any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question, but no set conclusion is expected.

Candidates will benefit from knowing (in outline at least) the main political events of 1918 to 1924. All of the parties, including Labour, suffered from having to confront the serious social and economic problems bequeathed by the First World War. The issue is who was best placed to deal with the social and economic consequences of the War.

Supporting the assertion. Source A. Having made important war-time contributions to Government, the Labour Party shows a new confidence in laying out ambitious plans for

what would effectively be a welfare state, replacing the discredited efforts of the pre-war Poor Law. After the Election of 1918, Labour only had 63 seats. Yet, effectively, with the Liberals split, and Lloyd George the leader of a Conservative dominated coalition, Labour was moving towards becoming the second party. However, candidates may point out that the conference resolutions in **A** were probably unrealistic. At this stage, Britain's post-war economic weaknesses were not yet fully appreciated. Labour was informal opposition aware of the new democratic vote to all men and was eager to claim the progressive agenda.

Source B mentions the revolutionary pressures of 1919. These would tend to strengthen Labour's appeal to the newly-enfranchised working classes but it also suggests Lloyd George's Coalition to be the best placed, indicating significant achievement to date.

Source D strengthens the view that the Liberals are on the way out, and that Labour has now (late 1923, and with 191 seats gained in the recent election) replaced them as the chief rival to the Conservatives although Amery calculates politically that both Liberal and Labour would be hampered by coalition and lack achievement – a calculation that was proved correct. The eventual result, mentioned in **Source E**, is the formation of the First Labour Government under Ramsay MacDonald. One might suppose that (by 1924) Labour was in a much stronger position to introduce its social reforms, although it was a minority government. **E** condemns it for selling out on more radical solutions to post-War problems. The main success was the Wheatley Housing Act of 1924.

Opposing the assertion. Source B suggests that Lloyd George (Prime Minister in a strong Coalition Government, dominated by the Conservatives) by taking bold action, especially on housing, can head off threats from the Left. The Whitley Councils are an example of LG's success in his early reforms, as is Addison's Housing Act of 1919 and Fisher's Education Act. However, by 1922, Lloyd George is being overwhelmed by his problems. The Whitley Councils were scrapped in 1921. Lloyd George was forced to accept the Geddes call for cuts in expenditure (see **Source C**). This source could be used to measure the extent of the problem for all parties. It clearly limited the prospect of the then government and especially the Lloyd George Liberals. The economy continued to stagnate. Later in 1922, LG fell from office, and was replaced by Bonar Law. The Conservatives had a tendency to split over tariff reform, the traditional Conservative solution to Britain's problems, but soon recovered given the prospect of government freed from Lloyd George's spell.

Source C clearly suggests a severe blow to any political party considering social reform, especially the kind of proposals favoured by Labour. The implication in **Source D** is that the Conservative Party, despite a loss of electoral support in 1923 over protectionist policies, will soon recover its pre-eminent position, although it fails to mention post-War economic/social problems. With hindsight, Amery's advice to Baldwin (which Baldwin took) is seen to have been well-founded. Indeed, the First Labour Government was to be short lived. And **Source E** indicates that a Labour Government under Ramsay Macdonald was less likely to support the radical social reform that socialists like the Webbs wanted than the Lloyd George Liberals. There were some radical plans to deal with rising unemployment, but most never came to fruition.

4 **Churchill 1920-45**
The Election of 1945

(a) **Study Sources A and B.**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the appeals made to the electorate in the campaign leading to the General Election of 1945. [30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence’ for....The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Content: **A** refers to Labour’s experience in war; **B** seems to denigrate it by reference to ‘Gestapo’ – something that Labour had been fighting against. Both refer to the ordinary man- but **A** is more effective, claiming that the victory in the war was won by the people. For **B** the people must be protected against the power of the state. **A** says that the state will provide full employment and proper social security – the emphasis is on collective protection against hard times. **B** stresses individual liberty against the power of the state. Essentially **A** is offering a view of a beneficent state making up for deficiencies in past Conservative policy. **B** is seeing an oppressive state and equating Labour with totalitarianism, both Nazi and Communist. **A** is far more positive and effective, pointing to actual past Conservative failures. **B** relies on a less realistic view of Labour with the emphasis on what Labour might do – ignoring their wartime achievements. The tone of the passages is different – **A** looks forward positively, though it is critical of opponents; **B** offers, here, no positive commitments but a negative – Labour is going to threaten liberty and the Conservatives offer the status quo of traditional liberty, something **A** dismissed as equating to “mean and shabby treatment”.

Provenance of Sources: **Both** are election appeals; **both** exaggerate the weaknesses of the opponents because it is election time. However, **Source A** is a considered and prepared written response. In fact the Conservative written manifesto said much the same about social reform and Churchill’s government endorsed the Beveridge Report. However, **Source B**, Churchill’s speech is much less considered and more improvised – he seems to have gone back to his early attacks on socialism and is equating Labour with totalitarianism in an extreme manner which runs contrary to his own manifesto. **A**, a collective document prepared by Labour as a whole must be contrasted with **B**, a flight of oratory which met with little enthusiasm within the Conservatives and showed Churchill to be out of touch with the mood of the times. The sources are useful for showing the reasons for Labour’s victory and Churchill’s limitation as a peacetime politician. Whereas **A** is quite typical of Labour’s appeal in 1945, **B** is not typical of what the Conservatives were actually offering although they are, classically, Churchill. Candidates might consider that **A** is more valuable for explaining the issues of the election while **B** showed why the Labour appeal was strengthened, so there is no set answer required for the relative value of the two sources, but candidates have the opportunity to assess this.

(b) **Study all the Sources**

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the main reason for Churchill’s election defeat in 1945 was the policy of social reform offered by Labour. [70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The debate here is whether Churchill’s conduct of the election and the poor Conservative record on social issues before the war were the key reasons, or whether it was Labour’s ability to offer a strong campaign and the public’s expectations for greater social reform

that were the main reasons. The war had brought a lot of changes and hopes. Did the electorate think that Labour was more likely to deliver those hopes; or did the Conservatives throw away the trump cards they held by poor electioneering? The actual popular vote was closer than the large parliamentary majority gained by Labour suggests and Churchill thought that he would win until very close to the actual poll.

Sources B, C and E support the view that Churchill misjudged the campaign, and by implication this rather than the offers of social change was the most important factor. though Thatcher also stresses some advantages that Labour had. **B** is a famous opening speech in which Churchill equates Labour with the Gestapo and stands, as he did in 1940, as the champion of liberty.

With wartime propaganda stressing the fight for freedom, this might have seemed a good idea. However, as Attlee and his colleagues had stood alongside Churchill since 1940 as bitter enemies of Fascism, this sort of rhetoric seemed absurd. Also, the USSR was popular at this time and there was an increased interest in state planning. Wartime reports such as Barlow and Uthwatt had recommended this. Full employment was thought possible and the Conservatives were pledged to implement Beveridge and to provide a health service. Wartime reconstruction could not be left to private enterprise. Few were convinced by the simplistic rhetoric produced by a leader whose main preoccupations had been foreign policy.

The reactions of Thatcher (**E**) and Sackville-West (**C**) are similar. However Thatcher is writing with the benefit of hindsight. Knowing that Churchill lost the election might colour her view of remembering that he had gone too far as she listened to the broadcast in her Oxford College. She is balanced enough to provide some wider analysis – this is after all a published work. Vita Sackville West is not attempting analysis but a ‘gut reaction’ in a private letter. Unlike Thatcher, she knew Churchill and there is some personal disappointment that he seems not to be rising to the challenge of domestic politics.

Labour on the other hand responded more successfully to the highly emotional mood of the nation which the cartoon (**D**) so vividly represents. The issue of a lasting peace and a post-war Europe which will avoid the destruction of war and the sufferings of soldiers seems here to be paramount rather than social reforms or Churchill’s misjudgements. This is an appeal to the emotions from a left wing newspaper on the eve of the election. That cartoon represents an injured and battered soldier amid destruction offering a very hard won peace to the nation. The poor Conservative policies of the inter-war years referred to in **A** must not come again. As **A** says, this was a war won by the ordinary people represented in **D**. **A** is obviously intended as election propaganda but offers ‘proper social security’. This is the source that supports the view of the question most fully. Not the rhetoric of **B**, but the firm promises of social services and full employment were needed. As **E** says Labour could outbid the Conservatives on this front. The Labour ministers had been in charge of domestic policy during the war. Conservative commitment to Beveridge was doubted by many. This was Labour’s home ground and they could point to the apparently poor record of the National Governments of the 1930s – Means Test, high unemployment etc. Churchill had not been part of this, but he was shackled to a Conservative party which had been seen, despite its reforming aspects in the 1930s, as uncaring. Thatcher’s analysis can be defended. Also Churchill could not gain all the credit for victory in what **A** rightly identifies as a people’s war led by a coalition involving Labour and Liberals.

Candidates might know about the younger generation’s radicalism, the influence of the Army Current Affairs discussions, the influence of wartime discussions about the post-war world, especially the Beveridge Report of 1942, about which many Conservatives were privately and publicly luke warm. Churchill gave priority to military and diplomatic concerns rather than post-war social policy. There were concerns about the disappointing aftermath of World War I, and an admiration for the Soviet achievement. They might contrast dynamic Labour figures like Bevin, Bevan, and Morrison with some lacklustre performances by the Conservatives who were over-reliant on Churchill’s prestige now squandered in what **C** considered a “confused and wordy” response. Certainly, Churchill’s

concerns in 1945 – for the post-war settlement, for Eastern Europe, for Britain's Empire – were not the concerns of many of his voters.

Three of the sources are Conservative, their focus is on Churchill (his speech and the reaction to it) but **B** and **E**, implicitly and explicitly, acknowledge the role of social reform. The two Labour sources, **A** and **D**, focus largely on this and imply success for this very reason.

UCLES

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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

History

Advanced GCE F964/01

European and World History Enquiries. Medieval and Early Modern 1073-1555

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

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

Notes related to Part A:

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

Marking Grid for Question (a)

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Total for each question =30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness. • Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue. • The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately. • Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these. <p style="text-align: center;">15-16</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts. • Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue. • The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly. <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control. • Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made. • Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue. • The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent. <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both. • Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely. <p style="text-align: center;">10-12</p>

Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted. • A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence. • Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it. • Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach. <p style="text-align: center;">8-9</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and /or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion. • Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding. • Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication. <p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit • Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation. <p style="text-align: center;">6-7</p>
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement. • Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context. • Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic. • Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused. <p style="text-align: center;">3-5</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance. • Weak or non existent context with no conceptual understanding. • No structure with extremely weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment. • Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

	A01a and b	AO2a and b
1	20-22	42-48
2	17-19	35-41
3	13-16	28-34
4	9-12	21-27
5	6-8	14-20
6	3-5	7-13
7	0-2	0-6

Notes related to Part B:

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

AOs	A01a and b	A02a and b
<p>Total mark for the question = 70</p>	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
<p>Level 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p style="text-align: center;">20-22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation. • Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer. <p style="text-align: center;">42-48</p>
<p>Level 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p style="text-align: center;">17-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent. • Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">35-41</p>

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

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

The First Crusade, its Origins and the Crusader States 1073-1130

1 The capture of Jerusalem

(a) Study Sources A and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for the motives driving the crusaders.

[30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer. **A** points up some sense of religious fervour but also plundering while **C** places emphasis on divine intervention, godly zeal and inspiration. The tone and language of each can be engaged: **C** has a spiritual nature and construction, while **A**, mentioning 'rejoicing to worship', offers a more contrasting tone in the 'seizing gold and silver...'. Source **A** suggests religious zeal early on and at the end but also points up blood-lust, material booty rewards from the siege and capture; its tone and language are worthy of comment. Source **C** denies ambition, fame, repute, materialism and stresses religious inspiration at the core of crusading intentions. Comments upon authorship, tone (etc) and discrepancies will be valuable. There is evidence for economic motives, territorialism, the search for glory and ambition. The provenances may be engaged: both dated from a similar time frame; both have knowledge of the events; they diverge to some extent in their explanations. **C** is post the success of the First Crusade. The author of the Gesta in **A** was present on crusade and possibly at Jerusalem; Guibert in **C** was not. His purpose was to glorify the Crusades in the West, in effect re-writing the Gesta. His style is rhetorical – what other motive could there be? Thus he seeks to explain at a higher moral level than **A**.

Such comments on the provenances will aid evaluation. Authorship and date can be assessed. Both are written later and the dates are similar. **A** considers the immediate reasons for success while **C** offers a sense of wider perspective, written with western Christendom in mind with arguably more focus on spiritual zeal and motivation. The fact that **A** was involved in the Crusade and **C** was not can be assessed.

(b) Study all the Sources

Use your knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the capture of Jerusalem was the result of the military skills of the crusaders.

[70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. The **interpretation of military strengths** is supported in Sources **A**, **D**, and part of **E**. Source **D**, from a Muslim point of view, offers a different perspective on the use of siege towers from **A** but agrees in essence on its overall account of proceedings. **An alternative view**, not least one focused on the divisions and disunity of the Muslim opponents, can be found in Source **D** and some of **E**. Topic knowledge can support the view of the Muslims as divided and disunited (eg the antipathy towards Kerbuqa in 1098) and **E** suggests a possible dilatory approach by the Egyptian army failing to aid Jerusalem. But much can be made of crusader leadership, strategy and tactics, religious zeal and adaptability to climate and conditions. **E** offers valuable comments about the 'fanatically brave and confident' army deployed at Jerusalem; it also points up the extreme conditions faced by the besiegers. Sources **A** and **D** focus upon military tactics and the methods in defeating opponents. Sources **B** and **C** emphasise religious enthusiasm, the great 'deeds of the Franks', 'miracles', the sense of God's favour.

Guibert doesn't refer to miracles but Fulcher does. Fulcher was not present at the siege, arriving later, but wrote to encourage emigration to the Holy Land stressing it to be a mystical and miraculous place. Knowledge could provide examples of this, eg the apparent appearance of Adhemar of Puy. As such, these are a representative expression of some of the main reasons. Notice can be given to tone and content of language and to provenances. Overall evaluation should embrace such. Candidates should put the siege and capture into its context, including the events of 1098 and 1099, and are likely to consider such issues and themes as the importance of the capture of Antioch (cf Source **D**), the internal problems facing the Crusader army, the leadership of the nobles, the use of tactics (including the cavalry), luck, the nature of Muslim divisions (seen at Antioch and prior to Jerusalem). They may consider that, given their internal problems and the lack of effective support from the Byzantine Emperor, the Crusaders' success was very much theirs. Then again, they may feel that the seriousness of Muslim splits and disunity (e.g. between Shi'ites and Sunnites, Turks and Egyptians, Aleppo and Damascus) were crucial factors and can be linked to **D**, some of **E** (the provenance of **D** may be commented upon). **A**, **B** and **C**, some of **E** place emphasis on crusader virtues, inspiration, fortitude and motivational strengths. The language of the first three, especially **B** and **C**, may prove useful to evaluation. Candidates may view crusader strengths, not least spiritual and religious, as crucial. Then again, they may feel that the weaknesses of their opponents gave them useful advantages at times. Some comparison of Crusader and Muslim religious zeal, leadership, strategy and tactics, morale, for instance, could prove effective here.

The German Reformation 1517-1555

2 Luther's beliefs and their impact 1520-25

(a) Study Sources A and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for Luther's teachings on how Christians should conduct themselves. [30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The author of both Sources is the same; however, the **provenance** is different. The audience of Source **A** is the German nation whereas the audience of Source **D** is directly John the Steadfast of Saxony, heir to Frederick the Wise but more generally 'the German princes' temporal authority'. Therefore Source **A** sets out general Christian theology while Source **D** refers to political power and princely duties in the context of Christian theology. Purpose and context are important factors in using provenance. Luther in Source **A** is laying down his religious beliefs to challenge the Catholic authorities and rally support before his final excommunication as a heretic. In Source **D**, he is advising the heir of his patron, Frederick the Wise, on how to defend himself from the ensuing enemies. This might be from Catholic enemies Electoral Saxony has made due to support for the excommunicated Luther, or perhaps Luther's Knightly supporters who are starting a war at this time.

The Sources are **similar**. In Source **A**, 'freedom' is of the Christian spirit which comes from faith in the Gospel alone; 'scripture alone' and 'justification by faith alone'. Faith frees a Christian from having to perform good works, as the Roman Catholic Church had taught. In Source **D** this translates as a justification of war as long as it is 'done in love' for the protection of a prince's subjects. Similarly Source **A** suggests a Christian is spiritually free as he will naturally act in a good way, being he is a good man. Similarly in Source **D**, if the prince is not in the right, then he is not a good Christian, so his people have no duty to follow him 'for one must obey God more than men'. In Source **A** this is expressed as 'justification by faith alone'. The Christian in Source **A** is a servant of all, and the Christian prince in Source **D** has a duty to his subjects and to offer justice and peace rather than war.

The Sources also **differ**. Whereas Source **A** sets out Luther's belief in scriptural equality, with all Christian men being 'kings' and 'priests', Source **D** refers to 'inferiors' and 'foreigners' as other categories of people besides 'equals'. This is ambiguous, but may be inferred to mean non-Christians. However, in the context of 1523, it is more likely to imply social inferiors, such as knights and peasants. In Source **A** Luther suggests Christians should act for the general good of others, whereas in Source **D** he suggests a just war may be fought 'force with force' to protect self-interest, and the deaths of the enemy may be justified out of love and protection for a prince's own subjects. The duty of a subject is to obey their prince if he is a good Christian, and lay down their lives for others, but to obey God first. Generally, in Source **A** more emphasis is placed on freedom than on duty and power which is stressed in Source **D**.

Brief comments on **context** must be credited only in so far as they aid the comparison. The excommunication of Luther, the old age of Frederick the Wise, the weakness of the Emperor in enforcing the Edict of Worms and the Knights' and imminent Peasants' Wars explain the differences in emphasis of the two Sources. Other key factors are Luther's purpose and audience. Source **A** is more typical of Luther's beliefs, as he is primarily a theologian rather than a politician. A supported judgement should be reached on their

relative value as evidence. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.

(b) Study all the Sources

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Luther's beliefs were revolutionary.

[70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The Sources contain references to different interpretations, so they may be grouped according to their view. The **supporting** view appears predominantly in Sources **A**, **B** and **E**, though **A** refers to a revolution in religious beliefs whereas **B** refers to political or social revolution and **E** to both. Sources **A** and **E** refer to the nature of the beliefs themselves as being revolutionary, while **B** and **E** refer to their revolutionary impact. The **opposing** view features in Sources **C** and **D**, which dwell particularly on the importance of duty and obedience, and justify actions traditionally accepted, for example all princes felt justified in waging war for defence.

The **supporting** view might cross-reference the theological beliefs in Source **A** with the social interpretation given to Luther's beliefs in Source **E**. 'Thus the Bible agrees that we ought to be free' in the Peasants grievances is their understanding of 'A Christian man is the most free lord of all, and subject to none' meant spiritually in Source **A**. A spiritual revolution is transformed into a social revolution. 'Christ has delivered and redeemed all of us, without exception, by His blood shed for the great and lowly equally', a traditional Christian belief in Source **A** is transformed into a social manifesto in Source **D**. These views inspire political revolution in Source **B**, by von Hutten and the Imperial Knights: 'Let us liberate the oppressed fatherland'. Knowledge might supply the social context for these misinterpretations; the political landscape of the Holy Roman Empire, social decline of the imperial Knights and serfdom of the peasants in some areas. The landlords in some parts of the Empire were Churchmen or monasteries, which adds extra heat to the grievances. This might explain 'they' in von Hutten's comment in Source **B** 'they have condemned innocent blood, but God will destroy them in their malice' in context of the excommunication of Luther and himself. Von Hutten's earlier support for Luther might be used in evaluating the provenance of Source **B**, and using 'force with force' features in both Sources **B** and **D**. The tone of **B** and **D** is more extreme than the other Sources. The tone of Source **A** is religious.

The Sources also support the **opposing** view. Sources **C**, **D** and **E** firmly back the power of the princes and their subjects' duty of obedience to them. 'You must render obedience to the powers that be, and sustain the powers of His Imperial Majesty' are very conservative ideas. This is despite the context of Charles' Edict of Worms banning Luther from the Empire. Comments on context and provenance might suggest that Luther needed support from John the Steadfast in the light of Frederick's old age (he died in 1525) and Luther's ban. Luther was also losing control of the German Reformation to the extremists, as shown by Sources **B** and **E**, so for his own protection he needed princely support. This might be linked to the content of Source **D**, where Luther's view is that the main duty of the prince is to protect his subjects, who together they should lay down their lives for the good of others. Luther sees his cause as God's cause, and 'one must obey God more than men.'

The **provenance** of the Sources should be integrated into the discussion. The authorship, context, tone and purpose of the Sources are revealing, as shown above. In Source **E** Philip Melanchthon, a moderate supporter of Luther, had considerable influence and wished to distance Luther's teaching from association with the Peasants' War by rational argument, unlike Luther's angry pamphlet 'Against the Murdering Hordes of Peasants.' Melanchthon was one of a group of moderate Lutherans who publicly denounced the peasants' interpretation of Luther's teachings and emphasised their politically conservative nature. Von Hutten in Source **B** represents the extremist view in the absence of a Source written by Thomas Müntzer, who had stirred the peasants to misinterpret Luther's teachings.

Supported overall **judgement** should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation that Luther's beliefs were revolutionary. No specific judgement is expected.

Candidates are likely to consider a range of ideas within the Sources: the nature of Luther's beliefs, perhaps conservative theologically, spiritually and socially revolutionary, and with a revolutionary political impact. They are likely to set the Sources within the context of Luther's condemnation for heresy, need for princely support and the outbreak of the Knights' and Peasants' Wars. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

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

Notes related to Part A:

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

Marking Grid for Question (a)

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Total for each question =30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness. • Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue. • The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately. • Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these. <p style="text-align: center;">15-16</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts. • Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue. • The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly. <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control. • Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made. • Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue. • The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent. <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both. • Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely. <p style="text-align: center;">10-12</p>

<p>Level 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted. • A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence. • Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it. • Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach. <p style="text-align: center;">8-9</p>
<p>Level 5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and /or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion. • Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding. • Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication. <p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit • Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation. <p style="text-align: center;">6-7</p>
<p>Level 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement. • Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context. • Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic. • Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused. <p style="text-align: center;">3-5</p>
<p>Level 7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance. • Weak or non existent context with no conceptual understanding. • No structure with extremely weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment. • Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

	A01a and b	AO2a and b
1	20-22	42-48
2	17-19	35-41
3	13-16	28-34
4	9-12	21-27
5	6-8	14-20
6	3-5	7-13
7	0-2	0-6

Notes related to Part B:

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

AOs	A01a and b	A02a and b
<p>Total mark for the question = 70</p>	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
<p>Level 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p style="text-align: center;">20-22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation. • Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer. <p style="text-align: center;">42-48</p>
<p>Level 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p style="text-align: center;">17-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent. • Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">35-41</p>

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

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

1 The Origins and Course of the French Revolution 1774-95**(a) Study Sources C and D****Compare these Sources as evidence for class divisions in France by 1789. [30]**

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for....' The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Content: **Both Sources C and D** refers to class distinctions. **C** refers to the difference in the way that the estates are taxed, but **D** goes further and refers to resentment at the control of the two privileged orders of government. Both refer to the grievances of the Third Estate, but whereas **C** focuses on the issue of tax, **D** offers more context – of a class whose education and wealth are not matched by any control over government. **D** mentions the people being kept down only by their habit of obedience; **C** reveals that that obedience is being strained by obvious inequalities such as the privileged postmaster – both refer to class antagonisms. Both deal with the political implications of class divisions – though **C** is still trusting in the King while **D** saw him as incapable of dealing with class resentment.

Provenance: The obvious point to note is the difference in the date – **C** in the early stages of revolutionary change, **D** in the heat of violent revolution and writing with knowledge of developments. The intention of **C** is to remedy grievances at a local level; the purpose of **D** to reflect on a situation which has led the author to personal disaster. **C** can be seen as typical of the grievances produced in 1789 but by its very nature an invitation to criticize the state and society which may exaggerate class division. **D** is writing with the knowledge that class division was expressed in increasingly violent form after 1789 and this may distort his analysis of the situation in 1789, **D** has more value judgements than **C** and makes a number of sweeping generalizations; **C** because it looks at a local rather than a national situation is more rooted in specific aspects, for example the postmaster. In terms of judgement about utility, **D** may be able to see the class differences in perspective, but may be too general and offer questionable propositions ('ruined through their taste for luxury') but **C** may be exaggerating divisions in order to gain tax concessions. Of course, **C** is more direct evidence for the situation in 1789 coming from that time, but **D** may be more able to reflect on the overall situation by 1789.

(b) Study all the Sources**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that finance was the main problem of the French monarchy by 1789. [70]**

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The debate here is whether financial issues were the main problem or merely the trigger for events which led to revolution, such as the calling of the States General. Other nations had financial problems and did not experience revolution, so was it really money or did money highlight the failures of the government? Did the decision to go to war lay at the root of the problems and were financial problems seized upon by a politicized and frustrated middle class?

Source B is most directly about the financial crisis and reveals the failure to pay interest to investors in 'gilt edged' bonds or loans to the government and deals with the failure of the King to carry on government despite a high income. This is a source from a foreign observer who may be dependent on reports, perhaps from critical sources and may well

bring a distinct view of the superiority of republican over monarchical government to bear on any analysis. Candidates may know the background to this – the successive failure of reform plans under Turgot, Necker and Calonne; the resistance of Parlements and the Assembly of Notables (**A**) to reforms; the criticisms of the royal spending and the link between financial problems and the summoning of the States General with all that entailed for the weakening of royal power. It is backed up by both **A** and **C** but the stress there is on privilege standing in the way of reform of finance. The engraving Source **A** portrays both Calonne and the Notables unflatteringly and refers to the unwillingness of the privileged classes to reform themselves. There had been a huge increase in book, print and pamphlet production in the reign of Louis XVI, and there a large number of critical engravings such as this one, ridiculing eminent figures. The engraving is likely to be read and understood by a limited number of people and is obviously polemical in intent, but is it typical of the unease about privilege? There was court hostility to Louis's reforming ministers and protests that ending of privilege was 'tyranny', yet the privileges as **Source C** shows had become a major concern at local as well as national level. What could have changed is the awareness of financial problems and their implications. After Necker's *Compte Rendu*, there was an unparalleled public knowledge of royal finance, helped by the spread of books and a better-educated reading public, Helped, too, perhaps by the influence of the *philosophes* as claimed in **Source D**. However, this is from a revolutionary writer who had been a leading Jacobin and was himself influenced by radical literature, so perhaps this is not typical. It may be unlikely that the peasants in **C** were much moved by 'enlightened thinkers' and their more practical grievances might be more typical outside urban centres than the picture painted by **D**. **D** does link finance, resentment about privilege, the enlightenment and the weaknesses of the King, and candidates may have contextual knowledge to estimate how accurate this analysis is. Writing in prison, Barnave in **Source D** is not concerned with his own position, but he may be seeing the situation in 1789 in the light of his own political ideas. **Source E** offers a neat summary, bringing in the point that war was a key factor.

Considering that help to the Colonists was a major cause of the situation that Jefferson describes in **Source B**, he does not seem very grateful to Louis XVI. This reflection may spark off some comment that the American War did bring back some radical ideas into France and may have caused some to reflect that Frenchman had fought for Americans to have freedoms which they themselves lacked. **E agrees with C** that the system of government locked up resources and prevented the effective use of France's wealth. So it could be argued that war was the key to all that followed (**E**) or that it was not so much finance but the weak political system that could not cope with it (**B,D,E**) or that not finance per se but privilege was at the root of problems (**A, C**).

2 The Unification of Italy 1815-1870**(a) Study Sources B and C****Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes towards Italian unification.****[30]**

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The **differences** between the two sources are many: revolution (**Source B**) is rejected in **Source C** (implying change by diplomatic means); a unitary state is proposed in **Source B** in contrast to a confederation in **Source C**; republicanism (**Source B**) contrasts with Papal authority (**Source C**); and the importance of the people in **Source B** in contrast to the emphasis on the princes in **Source C**. Some may detect the idealism of **Source B** including the reference to former national greatness in contrast to the more practical attitude of **Source C** highlighted in the final sentence. There are **similarities**. **Both** argue that change can be achieved by the Italians alone and that foreign intervention is not necessary. **Both** stress the importance of religion as a force for unity even if the emphasis in **Source C** envisages an extra dimension.

Evaluation of the provenance might hinge on the background of the authors and the context. Both authors were radicals as the introductory comments indicate which explains their desire for change. However, the differences in their viewpoint can be explained in part by their careers. Mazzini was committed to revolution as a former member of the Carbonari whereas Gioberti's experience as a priest may help explain his preference for the Pope as leader of a confederation. Mazzini founded Young Italy after the failure of the revolutions of 1831, compounding the disappointment of earlier failures in 1821-2, in both of which the Carbonari were involved. This motivation is made explicit in the second sentence of **Source B**. By the time Gioberti was writing even the option of Young Italy appeared unpromising given its failures in the 1830s and the experience of Italian politics since 1815 confirmed to him the strength of the princes including the incumbent Pope, and their reluctance to concede their power. Further, Gioberti clearly concedes the strength of local differences in Italy in the final sentence of **Source C** which might explain his reluctance to challenge established authority. As a Genoese, Mazzini had no particular regard for princely power after the incorporation of Genoa into Piedmont in 1815. Indeed, given his preference for a unitary state this fact was an example to Mazzini of the way to proceed.

(b) Study all the Sources**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that before 1847 it was expected that the fate of Italy would be determined by the people.****[70]**

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Most candidates are likely to suggest that **Sources A, B and D** lend most support to the view under consideration whilst **Sources C and E** appear to refute the statement. Better candidates will be aware of the shades of difference between the sources on both sides of the argument. **Sources A and B** place their faith firmly in the people: **Source A** denounces 'Nobles, Priests and Kings' implying confidence in the people whilst **Source B** asserts that

it was 'the masses who alone have the strength to save Italy'. Revolution is regarded as the means to achieve change and the views of the people are central, explicitly stated in **Source A**, with emphasis on education in **Source B**. They agree on the objective of freedom and equality for all. Their analysis of the reasons for earlier failed revolutions are the same both blaming inept leadership implying that if that problem was rectified the people would prevail. Knowledge of the revolutions of 1821-2 and 1831 would be useful to demonstrate this point. There is scope for some evaluation of the sources. Both authors were committed revolutionaries: Buonarrotti had taken part in the Babeuf conspiracy in France in 1799 and subsequently established the 'Society of the Sublime Perfect Masters', and Mazzini, who had been converted to the revolutionary cause as a result of witnessing the failed revolution of 1822 in Piedmont, joined the Carbonari in 1827. Knowledge of the nature of this organisation would be useful. The populist tone of these sources might be explained by their purpose to attract support for their cause. Buonarrotti's secrecy can be explained as a caution borne of thirty years of frustration and betrayal in contrast to Mazzini's confidence in an open debate. Knowledge of the organisation of Young Italy might be supplied.

The author of **Source D** also appears to think that the fate of Italy lies in the hands of the people. He cites foreign exemplars of federated states where the 'consensus of the masses' is paramount which 'show the way for Italy', implying that a form of democracy is preferred. He emphasises the equality of the people and princes in matters of sovereignty. In this he is at one with **Sources A** and **B**. However, he bases his views on the historically long-established particularism of individual states. In this respect he differs from Buonarrotti and Mazzini who the author may have in mind when he says 'whoever ignores this will always build on sand'. Candidates may recognise the author's concern for continuity and apparent lack of interest in political change explained by his academic interest in economic and social improvement. Candidates might also comment on the fact that the author's ideas were widely read in intellectual circles and so represent a considerable and important slice of public opinion.

By contrast **Sources C** and **E** think that the fate of Italy lies more with the princes than the people. Gioberti specifically identifies the Pope as the figure most likely to command the respect required to lead a confederation and if so this would also enhance the strength of the princes which if harnessed would be for the good of all. His contempt for revolution implies he does not regard the people as the vehicle for change. Candidates may explain his conservatism because of his religious credentials yet also concede the potency of his views in a land where the power of the church was so evident. However, candidates may also know that Gioberti's views were not popular at the time of publication because of repression in the Papal States especially during the revolution of 1831 and the unpopularity of the Pope. It was only with the advent of Pius IX in 1846 that Gioberti's views gained wider consideration. Knowledge explaining the optimism surrounding Pius could be added. Balbo, in **Source E**, also thinks the princes are the key to change. This is evident in the opening lines which explicitly stress the imperative of princely power but also damn the people as agents of change. Furthermore, he specifically commends the House of Savoy and, by implication, monarchy as the political system best suited to Italy. Knowledge of the monarchy's position in events since 1815 would be helpful. Some evaluation of the author would be appropriate: as a Piedmontese aristocrat Balbo's support for the House of Savoy is unsurprising. Yet, despite this candidates might credit the realism of his views given the reference to Austria. Knowledge about the extent of their influence in the north and centre could be used to explain that the power of the princes would be essential to remove them. The events of 1848 might be anticipated.

3 The Origins of the American Civil War, 1820-61**(a) Study Sources A and C****Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes to fugitive slaves. [30]**

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

There are several **similarities**. Both testify to public opposition to the apprehension of runaways: **Source A** warns against 'Kidnappers and Slave Catchers' and the huge crowd in **Source C** confirms the opposition of the public. The Mayor of Boston is portrayed as actively in favour of the Law having issued an order according to **Source A** empowering the watchmen and police and in **Source C** he is reported as determined to uphold the laws of the land with the use of troops if needed. **C** also indicates the attitudes of the authorities in Washington, strongly in favour of enforcing the Fugitive Slave Act. The opponents of the Fugitive Slave Law are described as peaceful in their methods: **Source A** simply warns the 'Colored People of Boston ... to 'have Top Eye open' and in **Source C** the Mayor commends the crowd as 'peaceable citizens'. However, candidates may stress a difference between the two sources about the nature of the support for runaway slaves. The tenor of **Source A** is passive limited to advice for those at risk implying that they had to look out for themselves whereas in **Source C** supporters of runaways are shown to be more active and embraces ordinary citizens prepared to support those at risk.

Candidates may explain the opposition to the Fugitive Slave Law drawn in **Source A** as typical of the position of the abolitionists: those opposed to slavery in principle and practice were bound to oppose legislation that allowed the return of former or current fugitives. To that extent the source is a reliable representation of the position of abolitionists. Some candidates might question the reliability of **Source C** on the grounds that the size of the crowd appears unrealistically large given the population of Boston in 1854 (140,000). In addition, they might condemn the source as unreliable because of the anti-slavery position of the paper. Others might set this against the apparently factual nature of the report which suggests reliability despite the bias of the paper. The context of each source is informative. **Source A** appeared in the immediate aftermath of the Fugitive Slave Law and not only acknowledged the increased danger facing former slaves in general but the imperative to alert those in danger. The response described in **Source C** was occasioned by a specific case which explains the urgency and concern expressed by the large crowd. Candidates may consider **C** the better evidence given its reportage tone and its information on popular attitudes. **A** provides the view of a committed minority only.

(b) Study all the Sources**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 was unworkable. [70]**

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Candidates may interpret the sources in more than one way especially if they argue that the application of the Fugitive Slave Law (FSL) was, to a degree at least, dependent on popular support. The emphasis of the answer should, however, be on its applicability. **Source D** seems to offer the most conclusive evidence that the FSL was unworkable given

the verdict taken against Myers and the reference to three other states where laws against the FSL were in place. However, some may challenge this view on the grounds that the position of only four northern states left scope for the application of the FSL elsewhere. Candidates may interpret **Source E** in a similar way as this also bemoans the measures of 'State legislatures to defeat the FSL' and implies that the operation of the FSL will be dependent on the repeal of these State laws. However, the author argues that the law was workable as it had been proved legally valid and that with political will from the Presidency the FSL can be upheld as appears to be the case in **C** (Boston, Massachusetts). In both cases candidates may emphasise the southern bias of these sources, as the Vindicator represents the view of Virginia and Buchanan backed southern interests. Indeed, the language of **Sources D** and **E** is instructive: in the former the position of the court is reported as a 'monstrosity' and in the latter State laws are described as 'obnoxious enactments'. Informed candidates will confirm that northern states did introduce Personal Liberty Laws which effectively nullified the FSL and that the most northerly States like Wisconsin were strongest in their opposition whilst border states were less hostile to the FSL. Candidates should be able to identify 'the next President' (**Source E**) as Lincoln, following his victory the month before, and the widely held assumption that he was opposed to the FSL.

Most candidates are likely to interpret **Source B** as supporting the view that the FSL was unworkable because it was immoral and doomed to fail because of the public outcry that was anticipated. Reference to the Nebraska Bill, which was being debated at the time and the strong feelings it generated against slave power, as well as the accuracy of the prediction about support for the Anti-Slavery Society would be useful knowledge to apply. However, some may use the criticism of the clergy and judiciary as indicative of the successful application of the FSL before 1854. In evaluating the source some might query the judgement of the author given the idealism of his views and the nature of his audience whilst others might see him as realistic in implying the inevitability of struggle: the line 'Liberty ... save' might be used either way.

A counter argument can be built around **Sources A** and **C** which both show the determination of the authorities – the politicians (local and federal) and police – to implement the FSL. Indeed, **Source A** suggests that a network of informers existed dedicated to tracking fugitives. **Source C** makes it clear that despite public protest the FSL was applied. Many may argue that **Sources A** and **C** illustrate how the FSL could only be applied through fear (**Source A**) and force (**Source C**). Reference to the Booth case in Wisconsin might be made to stress the strength of will of the federal authorities. Whilst recognising that this was, nonetheless, consistent with the argument that the FSL was workable some candidates will acknowledge that this only takes into account those fugitives apprehended and that many escaped detection. To provide a rounded picture reference might be made to the 'underground way' and the numbers who defied the authorities (Southern estimates of the number of runaways ranged as high as 100,000 but the Census of 1860 identified only 803). Such statistics could be used to assess the significance of public opposition recognised in **Sources A** and **C** to the working of the FSL. Knowledge that Massachusetts later introduced a Personal Liberty Law could be seen as evidence that the State politicians bowed to the public mood. The provenance of each source could be assessed. Both derived from those opposed to slavery which is revealed in the language used – the slave catchers are described as 'hounds' in **Source A** and the public as 'good and peaceable citizens' in **Source C** – but each reports the situation in a 'factual' way.

4 Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-63

(a) Study Sources B and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for the success of policies on youth and education before 1933 and 1963.

Similarities: these can be found in the tone of the sources. Both imply an attempt to control and regiment. Both comment on this regimentation although in **B** Maschmann comments that some activities, less central to the Nazis, were less strictly controlled. These activities are precisely those which the Stasi in **D** are concerned to bring under control, revealing a lack of success.

The **differences** outweigh the similarities. **B** suggests the Nazis were to some extent successful in their policies. There was ‘a great deal of good and ambitious education in the Hitler Youth’. The author of the source implies that on the whole, young German people found these activities attractive, although of course, this was just one person’s view. Contextual knowledge can be used to evaluate here. **D** clearly suggests a failure both in political and ideological education, particularly in cultural areas, but according to **B** more of a success under the Nazis. **B** refers less to success in formal education than to success in the Hitler Youth, an extra-curricula activity; **D** discusses failure in the educational system itself.

Provenance: Obviously **B** comes from a pro-Nazi source and **D** from the Stasi. **B** is simply a personal recollection of a young girl’s experiences during the 1930s. **D** is clearly alerting the authorities to the need to tighten up control. There are obvious differences in the type of source: **B** comes from post war memoirs, from an ordinary German girl who joined the Nazi youth movements. It is a published source in which Maschmann, later, had to come to terms with this. She is concerned to be accurate and balances her points (successful Nazi ambitions for education versus the failure to curb thought and creativity). As such, given her motive, there may be reticence in revealing Nazi success. **D** is a confidential GSDR police report, kept secret until the fall of the regime. However, it refers only to one senior school in Dresden. Its typicality on failure can therefore be questioned but as an internal report such comments on failure are probably accurate.

In terms of judgment, clearly, one source points to success while the other points to failure. Here, candidates need to evaluate the sources and this links back to the provenance. Are the memoirs of a former BDM leader published many years later more trustworthy than a confidential Stasi report? Both are likely to be reliable in their assessment of relative success.

(b) Study all the Sources

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the sources support the interpretation that the Nazis and the German Democratic Republic pursued the same aims towards youth and education.

There is ambiguity in most of the sources and candidates should be able to point this out. **A, B, C** and **D** suggest similar aims; the indoctrination of young people, through education, youth organisations etc. **A** and **E**, superficially, have similar views on status and class – both concepts are to be viewed as outdated and thus opposed. However, their views on class are different. **A** regards class as a barrier to Volksgemeinschaft and folk unity. **E** regards class as crucial but looks to the elimination of barriers and the triumph of the Proletariat. In **E** the aim is to advantage and promote education for the working class at all levels in the DDR. This is different to the Nazi aim which promotes a “German” education. However, **C** and **E** show big differences from **A** and **B**: whereas **A** talks about creating a harsh, hard, brutal and

physically strong youth, with no emphasis on intellectual development, **C** gives much more rounded aims, with the emphasis being on peace loving, intellectual development and so on. However, **C**'s views on intellectual development relate more to academic achievement in science and culture rather than on developing a critical sense.

Candidates, clearly, should point out the context of a fundamental change in international circumstance. Two of the sources come from the post war, communist GDR, and one from a western historian. A fundamental aim here was to indoctrinate young people in anti-western, anti capitalist values. This is referred to in **D**. The aims and activities referred to in **A** and **B** are totally different - to create a sense of Volksgemeinschaft - belonging, togetherness and a warlike spirit. **A** and **B** both provide a balanced account of Nazi aims, Hitler and a BDM leader reflecting after the event. The DDR sources provide official insights on aims but lack the comments of a young citizen on the receiving end to match Maschmann in **B**. Fulbrook in **E** provides some disinterested assessment here.

Contextual knowledge should be used to evaluate and construct an argument. Clearly, both regimes were one party dictatorships with totalitarian ambitions, particularly in education. Both used similar methods to achieve these aims; political police; Gestapo/Stasi. Both regimes focused overwhelmingly on the young, in education and youth movements etc.

Obviously, the fundamental differences were in ideology, with the Nazis focusing on the classless, racially pure 'folk community', and the GDR focusing on class consciousness and class conflict in the context of the Cold War, hence the reference in **D** to "enemy activities", and the context of "peace" immediately after the Berlin Blockade in **C**. The generally anti-intellectual and racist emphasis in Nazi education is contrasted with the equally fundamental anti-western, anti capitalist element in East German education.

5 The USA and the Colw War in Asia 1945-75**(a) Study Sources A and C**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the problems faced by the Diem regime of South Vietnam. [30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The Sources **agree** that the Diem regime faced problems which required it to ask for American aid. In both Sources there is evidence of Diem's difficulties in enforcing the Geneva Accords which had 'temporarily' divided North and South Vietnam in order to gain peace there. The Sources refer to the setting up of 'an artificial grouping' (**A**), creating 'external' or 'outside' enemies in the North (**C**), the 'authorities at Hanoi'. Both Sources suggest that the communist ideology of the North is causing problems for the South: in Source **A** the formidable task of moving non-communist refugees to the South to avoid 'a communist ideology they hate' and in Source **C** the need for protection from a Communist program of violence. Both Sources treat Diem's problems as local rather than part of a global Cold War. In both cases the problems are eased by the provision of American aid.

But the Sources also **disagree**. Source **A** refers to the impact of the 'long, exhausting' Indochinese war against the French, as its **context** is soon after the French defeat at Dien Bien Phu, whereas in Source **C** there is continuing violence within South Vietnam in the form of assassinations, kidnappings and random violence by Communists. Contextual **knowledge** of the activities of the Viet Cong might be used to develop the comparison. On the other hand, Source **A** refers to the humanitarian problem of liberating several hundred thousand loyal Vietnamese citizens who have found themselves under communist rule in the North and taking them as refugees to the South. Own knowledge might identify these as Catholics within a majority Buddhist state, increasing the Catholic Diem's problems. Source **A**'s 'internal collaborators', are not in Source **C**, where the South Vietnamese people are seen as 'loyal' and need protection or they may lose their independence.

Contextual **knowledge** of the Cold War backdrop and wider containment strategies and domino theory may be used to show understanding of the comparison. The Korean War had not long ended when Eisenhower is writing Source **A** and he may wish to avoid another humanitarian disaster for his own reputation's sake. The **provenance** of the Sources may be used to determine which is more useful or reliable for explaining Diem's problems. Both authors have a wider global goal in containing communism, which may colour their portrayal of Diem's problems. Kennedy's comments in Source **C** suggest he has taken Diem's report at face value, while Diem may hide his own lack of popularity and brutal suppression of opposition among his people.

A supported **judgement** should be reached on which Source provides better evidence. Source **C**'s mention of Diem's report may make it less reliable, but increasing Cold War tensions by 1961 may make it more useful. Source **A** treats the problems as local and seems to be a little more objective. No set conclusion is expected.

(b) Study all the Sources

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the USA's support for independence was the main reason for its growing involvement in South Vietnam between 1954 and 1965. [70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The Sources contain references to both sides of the argument, so they may be grouped by interpretation. The **support for independence** is shown in Sources **A, B, C** and part of **E** which approaches Vietnam as a country struggling for national independence, whereas the **alternative view** is in Sources **B** and **D**, which present Vietnam as part of a wider anti-communist Cold War policy based on containment and the domino theory. In addition, Source **E** adds 'psychological containment' of the reputation of the USA as a new factor, introducing 'quagmire theory'. A completely different view may be pursued, by using Source **D** to show that the USA in fact made Vietnam dependent on the USA by conniving at the assassination of Diem, which embroiled it in the problems of Vietnam for moral reasons – it could not be seen to have helped the overthrow of Diem only to abandon his successors to defeat by the communists – a view expressed by Johnson in Source **E**, albeit without reference to Diem.

Support for independence is in Sources **A, B** and **C**, which, along with **E** refer to 'Vietnam', rather than 'South Vietnam'. The humanitarian effort to save non-communists and give them freedom in South Vietnam in **A**, 'political liberty inspires all those seeking liberty throughout the world' in Source **B**, and 'preserve their independence' in Source **C** support the view in the question. Own **knowledge** might be used to point out that the USA did not encourage the two parts of Vietnam to re-unite for fear of a communist majority. Diem's regime refused democratic elections, ruled in a brutal and authoritarian way, using concentration camps and massacring Buddhist opponents.

Source **E** also supports the view in the question, with the aim to 'defend its independence', and not 'dishonour that promise and abandon this small, brave nation'. Own knowledge might be used to evaluate the **provenance** – the standpoint of Johnson, in the light of his swearing in after the assassination of Kennedy who had left him a difficult legacy in Vietnam. Overall, the view in the question is less convincing as it does not take into account the broader Cold War **context** and treats Vietnam as a more local issue. Had national independence been the main aim of the USA, they should have encouraged Diem to allow elections, even if this produced a democratically elected communist government. Own knowledge might discuss US confusion of communists with nationalists in Indochina.

Sources **B** and **D** give **another view** that the Cold War policies of **containment** and **domino theory** were the main reasons why the USA supported South Vietnam. They view Communism as a monolith rather than seeing Vietnam in local terms. The domino theory is clear in Sources **B** and **E**, Vietnam as the 'cornerstone of the free world in south-east Asia' and 'the battle would be renewed in one country and then another'. 'The fundamental principles of American foreign policy' are in Source **B**. US reputation is at stake in Sources **B** and **E**, with promises made and defence of the 'free world'. **Economic reasons** – the trade and resources of south-east Asia – are also mentioned in Source **B**. The international **reputation** of the USA is a reason in Source **E**'s 'promise' and fear of appeasement as it is in **D** which, as a private telegram to Dean Rusk, may well provide telling evidence for the real reason for the continued US involvement in South Vietnam.

Source **D** also gives a different twist, by showing that the USA is prepared to connive at the assassination of Diem and allow a military regime to be set up in South Vietnam in

order to hold back communism, showing that Vietnamese independence is far less important than containment of communism. However, the **provenance** of Source D is Cabot Lodge, newly appointed as a strong Ambassador. He is merely giving his view, and may not persuade Kennedy's administration to become involved in Diem's assassination. Own knowledge suggests that the USA did nothing to prevent the coup, as Diem was a liability, but his death itself was a reason for increasing US involvement in South Vietnam

Candidates are likely to consider a range of themes within the Sources: national Vietnamese independence, containment and domino theory, economic and trade factors, US international reputation. They are likely to set the Sources within the shifting context of the Cold War. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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

History A

Advanced GCE **F966/01**

Historical Themes Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1715

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Maximum mark 120 for this unit.

2 answers: Each maximum mark 60

	A01a	A01b
IA	18-20	36-40
IB	16-17	32-35
II	14-15	28-31
III	12-13	24-27
IV	10-11	20-23
V	8-9	16-19
VI	4-7	8-15
VII	0-3	0-7

Notes:

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

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: - 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>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>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>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>32-35</p>
Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses mostly accurate and relevant evidence • Generally accurate use of historical terminology • Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear <p>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>28-31</p>

<p>Level III</p>	<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>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>24-27</p>
<p>Level IV</p>	<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>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>20-23</p>
<p>Level V</p>	<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>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>16-19</p>

<p>Level VI</p>	<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>8-15</p>
<p>Level VII</p>	<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>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>0-7</p>

English Government and the Church 1066-1216

- 1 'The king's absence abroad was the most important factor in the development of English central government in the period from 1066 to 1216.' How far do you agree with this judgement? [60]**

The possession of the continental lands, first in Normandy and then in the Angevin Empire, led throughout the period to absenteeism by English kings and the need to devise a system of government which could function in their absence. The office of chief justiciar developed as the answer to this. Originating in the role played by Ranulf Flambard, developing under Roger of Salisbury in the reign of Henry I, and reaching its height in the Angevin period when chief justiciar was a great office of state, the chief justiciar effectively ran the country in the king's absence, exercising vicegerent duties. Absenteeism led to increased bureaucracy, and the development of the chancery in its support, the chancellor being the greatest official in the later Angevin period.

However, candidates should evaluate the importance of absence abroad in relation to other factors in the development of central government. Some may argue that financial needs were more important. Increased costs of warfare and administration made kings keen to maximise their revenues through the systematic exploitation of finances and the development of the machinery to enable this. Ranulf Flambard's investigation of the king's revenues and supervision of their collection, the development of the Exchequer in Henry I's reign, sheriffs rendering regular account and the records kept in the Pipe Rolls are all examples of this. To ensure the efficiency of the system, sheriffs were repeatedly brought into line under the Angevins through the great inquests of 1170, 1194 and 1213. Justice could also be profitable and Henry I's and Henry II's judicial reforms can be seen partly as an attempt to maximise finances through centralised justice. Responses could also include the Conquest, as this led to a fusion of Norman ideas, including feudal government, and Saxon foundations, Henry II's desire to reassert control after Stephen's reign, the success of officials in carrying out their roles so that central government was able to develop, or the role of churchmen as leading officials. It is likely that less good responses will describe some of these changes or deal only with the king's absence. Most candidates will probably deal with absence and at least one other factor and attempt some comparison. Better answers are likely to deal with a wider range of evidence, compare and reach a conclusion.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 2 To what extent was the development of English common law in the period from 1066 to 1216 dependent on the work of Henry II? [60]**

Henry II established much of the machinery which made English common law effective and provided much of the impetus for its growth. The Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton which tightened up criminal law, the use of returnable writs, possessory assizes, general eyres, professional justices, juries all helped to standardise procedure and to bring more cases into the royal courts so that there was less variety in the justice on offer, and a much more systematic approach. Less good responses might simply describe the work of Henry II in developing common law and assert its importance. However, most candidates will probably recognise the need not only to examine this but to place it in the context of other factors and evaluate.

Developments essential to the growth of common law happened before Henry II. William I inherited strong Anglo-Saxon kingship which enabled the king's authority to be exercised effectively over the country, a prerequisite for the exercise of a common law, shire and hundred courts across the country and the writ. The growth of feudalism under William led to his classification of different types of land-holding which was essential to the

development of a common law for land-holding cases. Standardisation was also encouraged by the growth of feudal custom and seigniorial courts tending to adopt common practices. Henry I also contributed to common law by his use of local justiciars which promoted common enforcement of the law and his insistence on cases between different tenants being heard in the shire courts rather than honorial courts. Canon law and church courts also helped to develop common law as did the judicial clauses of Magna Carta. Candidates might well argue that Henry II was only building on the foundations already laid. The best answers are likely to pick up on the idea of 'dependent' in their evaluation and comment on it.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

3 Assess the view that archbishops of Canterbury had better relationships with the papacy than with the crown in the period from 1066 to 1216. [60]

Most candidates will probably limit their answer to Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton as these are in the specification and this is perfectly acceptable. However, credit should be given to relevant reference to other archbishops eg Theobald or Hubert Walter.

There is certainly evidence of archbishops enjoying much better relations with the papacy than with kings. Anselm argued with William II over a number of things including the quality of the Canterbury knights and recognition of the pope and went into exile because of it. He also argued for a while with Henry I over investiture and the power and authority of the church. By contrast he was supported by Urban II. Becket's archiepiscopacy was dominated by his quarrel with Henry I over the trial of criminous clerks in royal courts while he was supported, at least initially, by the pope who even threatened to place England under an interdict in an attempt to bring the quarrel to an end. Innocent III was so determined to have Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury that he was prepared to excommunicate John and place England under interdict. Since John could not accept this rejection of his traditional rights it was impossible for Langton to enter England until 1213. Langton's difficult relationship with the king was later exemplified by his support for the barons. It is possible that weaker responses will simply describe a range of examples to illustrate archbishops enjoying better relationships with the papacy than with the crown, or possibly vice versa.

However, most candidates will probably show that there are also examples of relations being better with the king than with the pope. The most obvious example is that of William I and Lanfranc who worked harmoniously to promote both Norman rule and church reform, as well as Lanfranc getting William's backing over his claim to the primacy. Lanfranc resisted Gregory VII's summons to Rome and kept England out of the Investiture Contest at a time when the papacy was keen to promote its view of the relationship of church and state. Theobald of Bec supported Stephen and thus helped him to become king. Richard and Hubert Walter enjoyed very good relations. Even Anselm managed to reach a compromise with Henry II in 1107, after which the Investiture Contest ceased to be a contentious issue in England. In contrast, popes sometimes deliberately undermined archbishops such as giving support to Henry of Blois instead of Canterbury, or to York instead of Becket. Innocent so changed his position regarding Langton that he suspended him while Langton's relationship with John improved as he released him from excommunication and tried to mediate between John and the barons. The best responses will examine a range of evidence from across the period and evaluate, reaching a supported conclusion.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 4 How far do you agree that rebellions with foreign support posed the most dangerous threat to Tudor governments? [60]**

Candidates should assess the overseas support that some rebellions received to determine what (if any) difference this made to the overall threat. Candidates could point out that not all rebellions sought to threaten the government. In fact, most rebellions were local demonstrations against unpopular policies and/ or ministers. These only became a threat to the government if they were mishandled (eg Wolsey in 1525, Somerset in 1549) but the rebels' motives did not include seeking to overthrow the crown. Of those rebellions that did aim to remove the monarch or change the dynasty, the most dangerous occurred in Henry VII's reign. Simnel had support from Burgundy and Ireland (strictly speaking it was not foreign) and Warbeck had the backing of Scotland, France and Burgundy, though in practice very few troops materialised. Candidates might compare these threats to the Northern Earls and Irish rebellions in 1580 and 1601, which hoped to receive or actually did get help from Spain. The latter made Tyrone's rebellion particularly dangerous as England was at war with Spain and the earl was hoping to achieve a measure of independence from England. Foreign interventions usually came in the form of military aid and money but, as Henry VII discovered, diplomatic support added to the threat. Candidates might argue that there were examples of rebellions presenting a dangerous threat which had no foreign support at all. Northumberland's attempt to secure the accession of Lady Jane Grey and Wyatt's march on London against Mary Tudor were very threatening. In contrast Essex's rebellion was effectively nipped in the bud and the Pilgrimage of Grace, which raised over 30,000 rebels and lasted for 2 months, never endangered Henry VIII's throne. The best essays are likely to focus on what constituted a 'dangerous threat' and set foreign support in the context of other factors before reaching a judgement. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 5 'Tudor monarchs maintained the obedience of their subjects in the same way.' How far do you agree with this judgement? [60]**

Tudor governments kept control of their subjects in a number of ways and the best answers should examine a range of methods to focus on both continuity and change during the period. Each method should be assessed to show why it was applied and why modifications or reforms came to be implemented. The best essays are likely to suggest that the Tudor period saw a mixture of continuity and change. The ways that are most likely to be discussed are: the leadership and unity which the monarchy gave to effective government, and the use of patronage and propaganda to enhance its image. Here there was much continuity though Henry VII, Henry VIII and Elizabeth applied propaganda more skilfully than either Edward or Mary. Legislation was increasingly important and both the Privy Council and parliament were used to overcome potential sources of disorder. Long periods of stability under Elizabeth could be explained by government intervention. The role of regional councils, in Dublin, York and Ludlow, and reforms to improve their performance, changes in law enforcement (eg extension of JPs' powers, creation of lords lieutenant, reform to the militia) and developments in legal procedures (eg the use of treason and martial law) could be discussed. Some consideration might be given to the landed groups who gave continuous support to the crown as councillors, administrators and military leaders, and kept order in the counties. The Church also played a constant role in preaching obedience to the crown. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 6 'Disputes over the succession to the English throne were the most common cause of rebellion in the period from 1485 to 1603.' How far do you agree with this view? [60]**

Disputes over the succession were a recurring cause of rebellion in England and candidates are likely to agree with the proposition. They are likely to refer to Lovel, Simnel and Warbeck, who championed Yorkist claimants and led rebellions against Henry VII, to the Aragonese faction in the Pilgrimage of Grace that wanted Mary restored to the succession, to Northumberland who tried to exclude Mary from the throne, to Wyatt who favoured Elizabeth's premature accession, to the Northern earls who backed Mary Stuart and to Essex who hoped to see James VI displace Elizabeth. Better essays may point out that disputes over the succession were not always the prime motive behind a rebellion, although this was true in most of Henry VII's rebellions and that of 1553, and better candidates will show an understanding of not only differences between rebellions but within rebellions. Continuity and change are likely to be discussed and, in this respect, candidates should refer to rebellions where disputes over the succession played no part. The Yorkshire, Cornish, Amicable Grant, Kett and Oxfordshire rebellions were primarily the result of taxation and/ or economic grievances, and the Western rebellion was mainly a response to the Edwardian Reformation. Indeed, religious issues were the cause of several other rebellions, notably the Pilgrimage of Grace and the Northern Earls, and several rebels in Kett's and Wyatt's revolts were dissatisfied Protestants. Irish rebellions may be cited as examples of disturbances that owed much to political, social and religious issues and, apart from Simnel and Warbeck who both sought help in Ireland, were not affected by disputes in England over the succession. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 7 How far was personal ambition the main influence in shaping Tudor foreign policy? [60]**

Candidates should assess in what ways the personal ambition of Tudor rulers and ministers influenced foreign policy making and compare its impact with other characteristics before reaching a conclusion. Personal ambition may be seen as the aim of rulers such as Henry VII to secure his dynasty, or Henry VIII to emulate Henry V in war against France, or Somerset's desire to defeat the Scots and secure the northern border. In contrast, the foreign policies of Mary and Elizabeth could be argued to have been less affected by ambition. However, some may argue that advancing the country's interests cannot be separated from the Tudors' pursuit of personal ambition. Candidates should also assess other possible influences such as political considerations eg national security, maintaining at least one strong ally, ensuring that the Netherlands did not fall into the hands of an enemy. Financial, economic and trade issues influenced each of the Tudors' policies and might be usefully considered. Essays are likely to stress the importance of finance which restricted the conduct of all administrations, though less so in the 1540s and 1580s. Limited finances resulted in defensive and prudent foreign policies and the increasing importance of continental allies. Better answers could examine trade issues, particularly in the reigns of Henry VII, Mary and Elizabeth, and some candidates may reflect on England's industrial and commercial interests that were adversely affected by Henry VIII and Edward. Defending the Church was never a principal factor in shaping foreign policy but England's break from Rome did influence policies in the 1530s and its Protestant condition affected relations with Spain and Scotland after 1558. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 8 **‘Continuity rather than change characterised England’s relations with France in the period from 1485 to 1603.’ How far do you agree with this view? [60]**

The focus of the question is on continuity and change and candidates should be rewarded where they are able to pin-point and explain moments of change as well as account for more consistent trends. Each of the Tudors went to war with France but for different reasons. Henry VII tried to avoid war but felt the need to restrain Charles VIII from overrunning Brittany and threatening England. Henry VIII liked war and wanted to extend English lands in France but was rebuffed by the equally prickly Francis I, who used the Scots to the advantage of France. The Protestant inclined Edward VI had to contend with the war-minded Henry II, who was determined to recover Boulogne, and Mary, ever loyal to her husband, was forced to surrender Calais to France in 1558. Elizabeth, eager to avoid financing a war, sought a rapprochement with France after 1564, and was aided by their expulsion from Scotland in 1560. Thereafter, she did her best to befriend the French without ceding to their demands. Long-standing rivalry, France’s support for and interest in Scotland, and England’s possession of Calais gave the generally hostile relationship from 1485 to 1558 more continuity than change but the period was not one of continuous enmity. The loss of Calais and outbreak of the French Wars of Religion, however, reduced the threat of a French invasion and made an alliance (signed at Blois in 1572) more feasible. The growing power of Spain under Philip II, the decline of the Guises and the rise of Henry of Navarre led to more continuity in the later years of the period. Candidates are likely to agree with the proposition but should discuss changes as well as examples of continuity. Anglo-French relations were affected by a number of factors, such as the personality of English and French monarchs and ministers, changing political circumstances, and the outbreak of civil disturbances eg 1549 in England and 1562 in France. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 9 **Assess the importance of the Netherlands in England’s relations with the Burgundian and Spanish Habsburgs in the period from 1485 to 1603. [60]**

Candidates should be aware that Burgundy and then the Netherlands were important to England throughout the Tudor period for economic, military and political reasons, and their answers should focus on the importance in Anglo-Spanish relations rather than for England internally. Henry VII established trade links with Burgundy, which grew stronger as time passed and held firm in spite of later interruptions, until the Dutch Revolt in 1572. The subsequent decline in relations led to a re-assessment of overseas markets and the Elizabethan interest in transatlantic trade. Burgundian support for the Yorkists and its close proximity to London brought political security to the fore in Henry VII’s reign but Henry VIII’s friendship with Charles V (who was also Archduke of Burgundy), and Mary’s marriage to Philip, lessened its political significance until the outbreak of the Dutch Revolt. This necessitated Leicester’s intervention in 1586-7, which hastened war with Spain. The growth of Calvinism in the Netherlands in the 1550s onwards brought religion as an issue – Elizabeth’s implicit support for the Sea Beggars and Dutch rebels (explicit after Nonsuch) ensured the Netherlands after 1572 was central to Tudor foreign policy and remained important enough for Elizabeth to secure Dutch cautionary towns in the 1590s. Better essays should compare the Netherlands with other factors (eg responding to the more powerful states of France and Spain, securing dynastic alliances, the changing political circumstances in Scotland, the effects of English privateers). Weaker essays are likely to offer a chronological narrative and comment, which might assess the Netherlands and other factors but not in the context of Anglo-Spanish and Anglo-Burgundian relations. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 10 'Reform of the Catholic Church was the main aim of the Catholic Reformation in the period from 1492 to 1610.' How far do you agree with this view? [60]**

Candidates could begin by considering the main aims of the Catholic Reformation. These were to reform clerical abuses as highlighted by Savonarola, Erasmus, Colet, More, Luther and others; to restore public confidence in the clergy; to resolve doctrinal disputes arising from humanists and reformers such as Luther, Zwingli and Calvin; to issue a clear statement of faith that would re-affirm the Papacy's headship; to counter Protestant challenges, convert non-Christians and heal the schism in Christendom. Better candidates may well prioritise these aims and could do so by looking at how much attention was given to them by the Church. Reform of abuses, doctrinal issues and Church organisation were discussed in the Lateran and General Councils and pronouncements made at Trent in 1563, which were implemented down to 1610. Reunion and responding to the threat of Protestantism and a schism in the Church were not considered until 1541 at Regensburg and finally at the 1551-52 session at Trent which German Lutherans attended. Failure to achieve (or indeed earnestly seek) a reconciliation or compromise with the schismatics suggests that reunion was not a main aim of the Catholic Reformation. No attempt was made after 1541 to reunite the Christian faith in Europe. Candidates could point out that 'reform' was on the Church's agenda for most of the period: dealing with the legacy of Protestantism was not. Some essays might explain why this was the case, and point to the leading personalities involved at critical moments eg Luther, Calvin, Charles V, Paul III, Carafa, Pius V, and their differing objectives. All of the Church's agencies worked towards reform. They believed that a revived Catholic Church would weaken its Protestant rivals and in time see heretics return to the orthodox faith. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 11 'Erasmus contributed more than any other individual to the revival of the Catholic Church in Europe in the period from 1492 to 1610.' How far do you agree? [60]**

Erasmus was one of many who had a major impact on the revival of the Church and candidates can be expected to assess his contribution alongside others in the context of the period. He exposed many abuses in the Church between publishing *Enchiridion* (1504) and translating the New Testament into Greek, Hebrew and Latin (1516). He called for a general council and sought a reformation under a united Church through humanist self-education. Candidates may point out that his criticisms encouraged later reformers, notably Luther, Zwingli and Calvin, to challenge the Church more purposefully. Their formation of separate churches shook the Church out of its lethargy in a way that Erasmus failed to achieve. It could be argued therefore that Erasmus had a negative as well as a positive effect. A good evaluation of Erasmus is needed for Levels 1-III but so too is an assessment of other individuals in the context of the whole period. Candidates have a range of individuals to draw upon and the following is not an exhaustive or prescriptive list. They might refer to the contributions of popes and contrast the Renaissance popes who were the target of Erasmus' satires and ignored his pleas to reform with others, such as Adrian VI and Paul III, who responded. Later popes owed little if anything to Erasmus and persisted in proscribing his works. Some attention could be given to members of the new orders especially the Jesuits, who owed something to Erasmian ideals. Secular rulers notably Charles V and Philip II might be assessed but the former did little to revive the Church and even less to protect Erasmus from his critics. Note that the question is about 'individuals' and not 'factors' or 'institutions'. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

12 Assess the reasons for the varied impact of the Catholic Reformation in different parts of Europe in the period from 1492 to 1610. [60]

Candidates may assess a number of explanations for the varied impact and it is important that they focus on explaining the reasons with examples from different areas of Europe rather than describing or narrating the main developments in particular countries. The following explanations are likely to be considered:

- (1) the success of Protestantism, especially Lutheranism, Zwinglianism and Calvinism
- (2) proximity of the Papacy to the state concerned (eg. more successful in France, Germany and the Italian states)
- (3) political conditions of a state (eg. instability of France, attitude of nobility, support of secular rulers)
- (4) prevailing social conditions: rural communities were conservative in their attitudes towards reform and reluctant to abandon traditional practices
- (5) economic conditions: more urbanised states resented papal taxation, and were more receptive to Protestant ideas and propaganda spread by the printing press
- (6) extent to which Jesuit and Capuchin missionaries were well received (resistance in northern and western Europe; welcomed in southern and eastern Europe).
- (7) the influence of secular rulers: states where the reformed Catholic Church had the greatest impact were Spain, Portugal, Italy, Poland, Hungary, southern Germany and Austria. The least successful were England, Scotland, France, Switzerland, the Spanish Netherlands, northern and western Germany, Scandinavia. Candidates may well conclude that states where the Catholic Church had most success throughout the century had already begun to reform their church before the emergence of Protestantism. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

13 How effectively did the French Crown deal with the impact of humanism and Protestantism in the period from 1498 to 1610? [60]

Religious dissent proved to be an on-going problem for French kings and some were more effective at dealing with it than others. Candidates might interpret 'deal with' as 'managing', 'controlling' or 'suppressing' unorthodox views, and they are likely to look at the impact of humanism, Lutheranism and Calvinism. Most candidates are likely to focus on the crown's reaction to humanism and Huguenotism and better responses should be aware of the broader picture of religious dissent. Louis XII was relatively indifferent to calls to reform the Church, and Francis I, in supporting humanists, unwittingly encouraged the growth of Protestant ideas which, once established, proved impossible to extirpate. Henry II, like Francis I, strengthened the legal armoury needed to tackle dissent but was unable to prevent the growth of Calvinism among nobles, towns and Paris. His sons were singularly ineffective and failed to stop the militarisation of religious dissenters and the wars of religion. Some candidates might discuss attempts by the crown to accommodate religious groups and could usefully analyse Catherine de Medici's views and those of the *politiques*. Finally, Henry IV's strategy before and after Nantes needs to be considered: many may judge him as being the most effective monarch though contemporary Catholics thought otherwise. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 14 Which French king did most to develop the French nation state in the period from 1498 to 1610? Explain your answer. [60]**

Some candidates may well devote much of their answer to Francis I. He strengthened the internal condition of France through legal and administrative reforms, the political power of the monarchy, and the authority of the state in relation to the Church but weakened its finances and standing as an international power. Francis could be usefully compared with the contributions of Henry II, who will receive some complimentary judgements, and Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III, who most probably will not. The nation state relied heavily on strong leadership, which the later Valois kings failed to supply. Some candidates may credit Louis XII, who codified the laws, kept taxes and expenditure low, improved the administration of justice, created new *parlements* and was a popular ruler in spite of an unsuccessful foreign policy. Henry IV, on the other hand, could be considered to have done most of all to further the nation state. He began the rehabilitation of the country domestically (resolving religious and social divisions, laying sound economic foundations and restoring the crown's political authority) and internationally (in respect of Spain, Savoy, the Valtelline, United Provinces and Cleves-Julich). Some candidates might approach the question thematically and, with reference to individual monarchs, discuss the development of a more efficient and centralised administration, financial and religious reforms, papal relations, legal codes, suppression of over-mighty nobles, and the expansion of lands. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 15 Assess the impact of the French Wars of Religion (1562-1598) on the development of the French nation state in the period from 1498 to 1610. [60]**

Candidates should examine the effect that the French Wars of Religion had on the development of the state in the context of the earlier and later years of the period 1498-1610. The main areas of assessment are likely to concern the following:

- (1) Political features: the role and status of the monarchy, its relations with the French nobility, and trends in centralisation (eg. administration, justice, provincial estates and *parlements*).
- (2) Religious developments: existing divisions in the Church between Catholics and Protestants hardened and became militarised but the emergence of *politiques* pointed the way towards a religious compromise that was achieved at Nantes.
- (3) Economic trends: improvements and progress in developing government finances, trade, commerce, industry, transport and agriculture were all severely affected by the wars and recovery after 1598 was consequently slow and erratic.
- (4) Social features: the divisive nature of the wars accentuated existing trends and ensured many remained after 1598.
- (5) International standing: France was no longer the dominant European power by 1562 thanks largely to the exhausting and unsuccessful policies of her rulers since 1498 but the Wars of Religion weakened France further and allowed Spain to become the superior power.

The better responses are likely to evaluate developments before 1562 and after 1598 in the light of the Wars of Religion and be aware that some developments were halted, some accelerated and some changed. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 16 'The French economy had more weaknesses than strengths in the period from 1610 to 1715.' How far do you agree with this view? [60]

Candidates can argue for or against the proposition but both sides of the argument need to be considered. Arguments in favour of weaknesses may include: unequal and high tax burdens, few administrative reforms, corrupt, inefficient and self-serving officials, rising debts; high royal expenditure due to cost of waging war, profligacy of the court at Versailles; inadequate agricultural production due to medieval methods of farming; insufficient maritime shipping to compete with the United Provinces and English merchants; rising population that increased levels of unemployment, poverty and disease in the towns. A counter-argument is that the economy was strong. State revenue increased (400% under Colbert) and the government was able to wage war successfully for much of the period unlike its rival Spain; trade and industry expanded (eg arsenals and naval supplies); internal transport improved; colonies were set up in Canada and the West Indies; reforms were implemented by Colbert who cut court expenditure, abolished sinecures, lowered interest rates, amalgamated tax farming practices, reclaimed royal lands, increased the *taille* paid by landowners, regulated industries and built up gold and silver reserves. Better responses are likely to comment on elements of continuity and change. For instance, Richelieu had limited success at reforming the economy and focused on realising its potential without making fundamental changes. Mazarin was primarily interested in raising revenue to meet war costs but neglected other aspects of the economy. Colbert showed what could be achieved in the 1660s and 1670s though he failed to reform the fiscal system or establish trading companies. Between his death in 1683 and 1715, ineffectual ministers, Louis XIV's munificence and the continuous pursuit of military glory, left the economy in a precarious condition. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 17 To what extent did royal authority in France from 1610 to 1715 depend upon the personality of the king? [60]

Candidates are likely to argue that the personality of kings was one of many factors that contributed to royal authority in France. They should link the role of Louis XIII and Louis XIV in advancing royal power eg their desire to rule without a regency council, their support for suitable ministers who increased royal authority, their patronage of the arts/sciences, their command of the armed forces, the cultivation of kingship especially at Versailles. Differences between the two kings might be used to demonstrate how royal authority could depend on their personalities eg Louis XIII's role at the Day of Dupes in support of Richelieu, or Louis XIV's arrest of Fouquet, which signalled the king's desire to rule personally. The Fronde might be cited to show what could happen to royal authority if the king was a cipher. In addition to the personality of the king, other factors should be assessed eg the contribution of ministers such as Richelieu, Mazarin, Colbert, Louvois; administrators, especially the *intendants*, *officiers*, and provincial servants; the role of Versailles; support for the crown after 1653 of the nobility and *parlements*; with occasional exceptions the Catholic Church. It may be argued that royal authority was in fact limited by financial problems, independent *pays d'etat*, ambitious nobles, awkward *parlements*, papal claims, administrative self-interest, corruption and inefficiency. Better essays will probably suggest that royal authority fluctuated: it was weak in the years 1610-17 and 1643-53, and increasingly strong under Louis XIV until the final years of his reign. It is likely that candidates will give more attention to Louis XIV but Louis XIII should not be disregarded as unimportant. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 18 **'France's involvement in the Thirty Years' War was the major factor in its development as a European power from 1610 to 1715.'** How far do you agree with this view? [60]

Whether or not candidates agree with the proposition, they should evaluate the significance for France and for other nation states of its participation in the war, and compare the consequences with other key factors in its development as a European power. Arguments in support of the statement might include: territorial gains at Westphalia, which benefited France, the United Provinces and Sweden, and by inference weakened Spain and the Austrian Habsburgs; military and naval defeats inflicted on Spain by France and its allies that revealed the difficulties Spain faced in holding on to its overseas empire and position as the dominant European power; and France's delay in entering the war (from 1635) which meant that it was financially better placed to continue fighting Spain after 1648 until the latter was forced to submit at the Peace of the Pyrenees (1659). Candidates could contrast France's international standing between 1610 and 1635 with that of 1648 and the importance of staying at war until 1659. Some arguments may stress the importance of Louis XIV's wars (eg the Dutch War 1672-78, War of the League of Augsburg 1689-97, War of the Spanish Succession 1702-14), and the king's role in pursuing war aims for much of his reign. Others might stress the appointment of a minister such as Richelieu, Mazarin, Colbert, Louvois, as a key factor. A good sense of continuity and change in France's position as a European power resulting from an assessment of different factors including the Thirty Years' War should be well rewarded. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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

History A

Advanced GCE F966/02

Historical Themes Option B: Modern 1789-1997

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Maximum mark 120 for this unit.

2 answers: Each maximum mark 60

	A01a	A01b
IA	18-20	36-40
IB	16-17	32-35
II	14-15	28-31
III	12-13	24-27
IV	10-11	20-23
V	8-9	16-19
VI	4-7	8-15
VII	0-3	0-7

Notes:

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

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: - 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>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>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>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>32-35</p>
Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses mostly accurate and relevant evidence • Generally accurate use of historical terminology • Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear <p>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>28-31</p>

<p>Level III</p>	<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>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>24-27</p>
<p>Level IV</p>	<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>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>20-23</p>
<p>Level V</p>	<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>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>16-19</p>

<p>Level VI</p>	<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>8-15</p>
<p>Level VII</p>	<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>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>0-7</p>

Theme 1: The Challenge of German Nationalism 1789 – 1919

- 1 Assess the view that the ideas and aims of German nationalism changed significantly during the period from 1789 to 1919. [60]**

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period. Candidates should assess whether the ideas and aims of German nationalism changed significantly in this period or whether they predominantly remained the same. Candidates should focus on the dominant ideas and aims of German nationalists during this period, from the aims of the growing emergent nationalist movement from 1789 to the aims of more radical nationalists in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries. The development and impact of ideas on the aims of nationalism should be explored. Candidates may argue that the common fight of people from different German states against the French, especially in 1813, gave strong impulses to nationalism. A few intellectuals consequently demanded the unification of all German-speaking lands, although they represented a minority. Candidates are likely to show knowledge of developments in intellectual nationalism in the first half of the Nineteenth Century. Candidates might well demonstrate understanding of the debate about Grossdeutschland or Kleindeutschland in the period 1815 – 1871 and the reasons for the development of more radical nationalism in the remainder of the period. Candidates might explain the importance of economic factors on the changing aims of German nationalism, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussia's economic strength and Prussian leadership of Germany. Candidates should understand how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870 / 71. Bismarck's opportunistic and skilful leadership clearly had a significant impact on the development of German nationalism too. The change of heart from 1866 when liberals became national liberals may well be stressed by some candidates. The impact of the foundation of the Second Reich from 1871 clearly had a profound effect on the development of nationalism during the latter part of this period as did the accession to the throne of Wilhelm II. Candidates may focus on the more radical nationalism of the Wilhelmine period and its ultimately disastrous impact on the German nation. The Great War left Germany broken and half-starved with the aims of German nationalists in tatters.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 2 Assess the view that the Prussian victory over Austria in 1866 was the most important turning point in the growth of German nationalism in the period from 1789 to 1919. [60]**

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period. Candidates should focus on the phrase 'most important turning point' in their answers. Candidates may argue either for or against the Prussian victory over Austria in 1866 as the most important turning point, but must do so comparatively in the context of other turning points. In assessing the significance of the Prussian victory over Austria in 1866 candidates are likely to stress the decline of Austrian influence in Germany, the North German Confederation and the consequent domination of Germany by Prussia. What follows is not an exclusive list of other potential turning-points, but obvious consideration could be given to 1789, 1813, 1815, 1848-49, 1870/71, 1888 (and / or 1890) and 1914. Clearly answers of the very highest quality can be written without considering all of these potential turning points, but the most able candidates will demonstrate a breadth of vision and a good understanding of the moments that shaped the destiny of German nationalism.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

3 To what extent did German nationalism have mass appeal in the period from 1789 to 1919? [60]

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period. Candidates should focus on 'to what extent', 'German nationalism' and 'mass appeal' in their answers in an attempt to evaluate the mass appeal of nationalism in this period. Candidates should evaluate the extent to which nationalism had mass appeal and demonstrate awareness that such appeal was not uniform but fluctuated. Candidates may demonstrate that concepts of romantic nationalism had a limited intellectual appeal. Candidates could consider the extent to which nationalism appealed or failed to appeal to the people at various points, for example from 1789 – 1815, 1815 – 1848, from 1871 - 1914 and in 1918. Candidates may well demonstrate that they understand that Wilhelmine Germany increasingly looked to exploit nationalist yearnings and the mass appeal of German nationalism, pursuing a populist foreign policy to distract the masses from social discontent. Candidates might choose to demonstrate that the mass appeal of nationalism may be compared to the mass appeal of other philosophies. For example the growing industrialization of Prussia and the German Empire was mirrored by the growing mass appeal of socialism, an appeal that proved relatively immune to either appeasement, in the form of state socialism, or repression. Distress from the winter of 1916 / 1917 onwards, and defeat in 1918, led to the socialist uprisings of late 1918 and early 1919 and the establishment of Ebert's republic. However, even in 1919 the appeal of unrequited nationalism was never far from the surface, as evidenced by the Freikorps and the emerging 'stab-in-the-back' theory.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

Theme 2: The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792 - 1945

- 4 'The concept of 'total war' should be applied only to conflicts in the twentieth century.' How far do you agree with this view of warfare in the period from 1792 to 1945?**

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the whole period.

The two twentieth century conflicts we might expect to be addressed are the First and Second World Wars. Both easily fit the concept of total war very well due to their geographic spread, the economic and political commitment needed by the victorious powers, the scale of the military forces involved, the scale of the carnage, and the involvement of large percentages of the populations of the combatant states.

There are many nineteenth and eighteenth century conflicts that might be used to counter the line advanced by the question. The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars might be argued to rival WWI and II in scale and all of the criteria for total war advanced above could be applied to these conflicts. The same argument can be applied to the ACW. The Wars of Unification in the middle part of the nineteenth century are less convincing candidates for total war due to their short duration and limited domestic impact. Alternatively the Russo-Japanese War also does not easily fit the concept of total war.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 5 To what extent did developments in transport revolutionise warfare in the period from 1792 to 1945?**

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the whole period.

Transport will probably concentrate on the application of steam power in the form of railways (and steam ships where their use applies to land warfare – the Crimean War springs to mind) in the nineteenth century and the impact of the internal combustion engine in the twentieth. Candidates need to be aware, however, that railways also had a large impact on WWII. The response must use this knowledge in an analytical fashion with focus on the specific demands of the question set. Examples might be rapid strategic movement, the ability to mobilize large numbers of soldiers, its impact on concentration of force and movement across the battlefield. The obvious examples of the impact of railways are the 1866 Austro-Prussian War, the opening months of WW1 and the support of military activity on the Eastern Front in WWII. Better candidates might argue that the railway only took armies so far and once separated from rail networks soldiers moved as fast as their 18th century forebears had done. For the impact of the internal combustion engine in WW1 candidates might consider lorries, tanks and aircraft. The effect of this technology on WWII is obvious with true mechanised warfare dominating all European and North Africa fronts. For tanks, APCs and aircraft we might expect some discussion of use in battle. For pre-steam technologies use of waterways to transport troops or mass use of horse drawn carts were important. The former was a common feature of war in the later 18th and early 19th centuries, the latter was used on occasion by Napoleon, for example to move part of his army in 1805.

Alternative positions might point to continuity across the period. For example, the limits of railways allowing troops to be massed at given points but then having to march to war as their forefathers did, this certainly applies to the wars of the mid-19th century and WW1 and arguably also applied on the Eastern Front in WWII. The limits to mechanisation of transport in WWI & II are possible alternative interpretations. On the Western Front in WWI the nature of trench warfare seriously hindered the successful application of transport innovations to war. In WWI the Eastern Front saw transport technology very similar to that of Napoleon's wars. This is also the case on the Eastern Front in WWII where the number of fully mechanised formations was small and the bulk of the armies fought using transport technology that would be familiar to the armies of the Austro- or Franco-Prussian Wars. Some candidates may counter-argue that factors in addition to transport also revolutionised warfare. If so, technological developments, strategic ideas, and the introduction of conscription could be usefully assessed. A balanced and evaluative response is required.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

6 'Victory in war was determined by superior economic power.' To what extent do you agree with this view of the period from 1792 to 1945?

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the whole period.

Responses will need a sound understanding of what is meant by economic power and its impact on conflict. Candidates need to be able to discuss the relative economic power of various combatant states during the period studied and its impact on the outcome of wars. Economic power might be encountered in many forms; industrialisation, commerce, agricultural output, etc. Britain's commercial and emerging industrial strength might be contrasted with France's in the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. The chronic economic underdevelopment of Russia might be the main reason for allied victory in the Crimean War. The limited ability of the economy of states such as Prussia to sustain long term wars in the middle century might be discussed. On the other hand, the economic power of Prussia might be compared to her opponents in the wars of 1866 and 1870-71. The success of an economically weaker Japan in the Russo-Japanese War challenges the precept of the question. The First and Second World Wars are tailor made for the question. The ACW is also a case in point with the larger more sophisticated economy of the Union defeating the South but only after some time. Candidates might refer to the technology produced by the economies of combatant states but this must be linked to the specific demands of the question set. Also the development of the scale of warfare as the period went on and the impact on economic systems might be a worthwhile area for discussion.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Theme 3: Britain and Ireland 1798 – 1921

7 'O'Connell was the most effective leader of constitutional nationalism in the period from 1798 to 1921.' How far do you agree with this view?

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the whole period.

Effective answers will be comparative in nature, considering O'Connell, Butt, Parnell, Redmond and Dillon. Comments on Butt and Dillon can be brief. The focus is expected to be on O'Connell, Parnell and Redmond, particularly their relative effectiveness in mobilising support and establishing clear policy and tactics. In O'Connell's case the achievement of Emancipation in the 1820s, reform within the Union in the 1830s and repeal of the Union in the 1840s are key areas. In the first two he achieved much, far more in practice than later leaders although, like them, Repeal and Home Rule remained elusive. Unlike Parnell, O'Connell did not see the need for economic or land reform, other than the ending of religiously based tithes. Parnell was more effective here, forcing Gladstone to reconsider Land Reform in the 1880s (linking Davitt's Land League to his cause). O'Connell's Roman Catholic Association became a model for 'constitutional' agitation in the 1820s but with less success in the 1840s. The NRA mobilised large numbers but Peel had by then removed the Freeholders. He also had less success in creating a disciplined Parliamentary party than Parnell, whose aims were much focused on Westminster ('obstructionism'). He gained complete control of the Irish political process outside Ulster. Both he and O'Connell became divorced from Ireland itself, O'Connell creating division over his 'moderate' tactics, whilst Parnell never recovered from the O'Shea Divorce case splitting his party. Nonetheless candidates could argue that O'Connell achieved more in association with the Whigs than Parnell did with Gladstone or Redmond with Campbell Bannerman and Asquith. Butt founded the Irish Nationalist party; Parnell gained a liberal commitment to Home Rule and substantive Land reform. Redmond secured Home Rule but not its implementation whilst Dillon ended up in alliance with Sinn Fein. Redmond could be accused of neglecting grass roots support in a way that O'Connell and Parnell never did. However O'Connell was never trusted in England whereas Parnell and Redmond were more effective in gaining the trust of Gladstone and Asquith. All three were broken, O'Connell by imprisonment in 1843, Parnell by the O'Shea divorce case (which lost him much support) and Redmond by the Great War and the Easter Rising. All depended on the fortune of Whiggery and Liberalism and all ignored Ulster, Redmond at great cost. Most candidates will see either O'Connell or Parnell as the most effective leaders although all could be considered failures, or merely effective in different ways. Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader. [60]

8 To what extent were British governments committed to the maintenance of the Act of Union in the period from 1800 to 1921? [60]

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the whole period.

One view of this is that all British governments of whatever political complexion were fully committed to the Act of Union, only Lloyd George and his closest colleagues in 1920-21 reluctantly abandoned this position in the face of Collins' tactics in the Anglo-Irish War. However it could be argued that governments came to regard it as having created more problems than it solved and sought to ditch various aspects. Better candidates will consider **Pitt's original aims** when framing the Act of Union in 1800. He was determined to **stabilise Ireland** after the Wolfe Tone Rising and was convinced that the Irish parliament was a destabilising influence and had to go. The incorporation of Irish MPs and Peers to Westminster was vital for him. Governments stuck to this until 1886 when

Gladstone introduced a Home Rule Bill that restored the Grattan Parliament with no Irish MPs at Westminster. However this was reversed in the Second 1893 Bill which would have restored representation at Westminster alongside that in Ireland. This arrangement was retained in the Third Bill of 1912 and in the Government of Ireland Act in 1920 (a Northern Ireland Parliament with Northern Irish MPs at Westminster). It could be argued that Pitt's commitment to the Irish at Westminster was maintained by all (except for Gladstone in 1886), despite most Irish MPs forming their own grouping, distinct from Liberalism and Conservatism, from the 1870s onwards. One could also point to the restrictive powers of the proposed Home Rule Parliaments after 1886 and even to the idea of Dominion status in 1921 for the Free State. **Defence fears** were as evident in the Anglo-Irish Treaty as in the Act of Union. The Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary, the former exercising viceroy like powers throughout the period, remained the key to Irish executive government. There was less commitment to the **religious aspects of the Union**. Pitt had wanted Catholic Emancipation to accompany it but Peel did not. The latter reluctantly conceded it in 1829, the Whig governments making it more of a reality through Catholic appointments. Peel went on to seek an accommodation with Catholicism via Maynooth, whilst Gladstone disestablished the Irish Church in 1869. Certainly Ulster Unionists feared that Governments would concede power to a Catholic Assembly in Dublin after 1886 but a commitment to Ulster was maintained despite the fears. **Economically** Pitt had high hopes for the Union, looking to wider market opportunities to 'raise' the Irish in the manner of the Scots. Few governments, despite the failure of such hopes, changed the nature of the Union in this respect, beyond some land concessions. Gladstone was careful not to concede economic control to a Dublin parliament and in 1921 the Free State was allowed continued access to mainland markets.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

9 How important were economic factors in explaining the development of Irish nationalism in the period from 1798 to 1921? [60]

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the whole period.

This is a wide ranging question and exhaustive coverage is not expected. A broad comparative brush is required. A case could be made that **economic factors** were very important. Nationalists stressed that Irish land had been looted by English conquest, her peasantry oppressed with high rents and controlled by ruthless eviction. The Famine was seen as an English induced holocaust, whilst Ireland provided the cheap emigrant labour to build an industrialised society on the mainland. However few made much of this point before 1845. Tone and O'Connell stressed political and religious emancipation. Their successors too made little of it. Parnell and Redmond continued to stress a political nationalism whilst the Fenians and the IRB took the route of nationalist terrorism. Only Davitt and belatedly Parnell exploited economic agrarian grievance via the Land League, the latter ditching it once he scented the political prospect of Home Rule. Connolly's Socialism made little headway outside Dublin, although Ulster nationalism used Belfast industry as a sign of divine approval for Protestantism, especially as a knee jerk protective reaction after 1886. There were few economic issues to exploit in the late Victorian and Edwardian periods and neither Sinn Fein nor Redmond used them. A more convincing case might be made for the importance of **political, religious and cultural factors** throughout. Better candidates will see the linkages between these. **Protestant** nationalism felt betrayed by the Act of Union, whilst **Catholic** nationalism was exploited by O'Connell and later used by De Valera. Sectarian divides fuelled the various nationalisms, reflected in the Ulster and Irish Volunteers which foreshadowed Partition post 1918. Both revolutionary and constitutional nationalism drew heavily on the **political tradition** of the enlightenment, liberalism and independence. Their leaders took a largely political line and adopted political methods to advance their cause (from Risings to Parliamentary

obstruction). A case could also be made for the **cultural impact** of the Gaelic revival from the 1880s, particularly for those who pushed for independence. Language, poetry, theatre and sport rejected the Anglo-Irish tradition of Ascendancy nationalism and owed little to economic issues. It provided a 'new' national tradition built on powerful myths, including economic exploitation. Ulster was busy doing the same.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your team Leader.

UCLES

Theme 4: Russia and its Rulers 1855 – 1964

- 10 How far do you agree that the October Revolution of 1917 was the most important turning point in the development of Russian government in the period from 1855 to 1964? [60]**

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period. Candidates should focus on the phrase ‘most important turning point’ and ‘the development of Russian government’ in their answers. Candidates may argue either for or against the communist takeover in 1917 as the most important turning point, but must do so comparatively in the context of other turning points. What follows is not an exclusive list, but consideration could be given to defeat in the Crimean War in 1856, the assassination of Alexander II in 1881, the 1905 Revolution, the February Revolution of 1917, Stalin’s gaining total power by 1929 or Stalin’s death in 1953 and replacement by Khrushchev by 1956. For example, candidates might argue that the assassination of Alexander II in 1881 marked the end of any hope of meaningful reform from above by the Romanov dynasty, and set the Romanovs on course for revolution and their downfall. Candidates may argue that February 1917 was the most significant turning point as it ended the 304 year old Romanov dynasty, but may argue that ultimately this led to the replacement of ‘Romanov Tsars’ by ‘red Tsars’. Many candidates will undoubtedly argue that October 1917 and the triumph of Bolshevism was the most important turning point as it crushed all possibility that a liberal democracy might emerge in Russia and transformed Russia into the Soviet Union – the world’s first communist state. Candidates however may well consider that Lenin’s death in 1924 was the most significant turning point, perverting the true course of the Russian Revolution because Stalin succeeded Lenin. Candidates who argue this are likely to suggest that Stalin’s victory in the ensuing power struggle led Russia down a very different road than that being paved by Lenin. Other candidates may use a counter-argument based on more recent archival evidence to suggest that there was significant continuity between Lenin and Stalin and argue this. Candidates may argue that Khrushchev’s secret speech of 1956 and subsequent de-stalinisation marked a significant turning point in the development of Russian government.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 11 Assess the view that Russia’s communist leaders did less than the Tsars to improve the lives of the working class in the period from 1855 to 1964. [60]**

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period. Candidates should focus on the living and working conditions of Russia’s industrial and urban working class. Candidates should compare the experience of the working class under the tsars with their experience under the communists. Candidates may wish to compare the expectations the working class had from their ‘Little Fathers’ with their expectations under the Bolsheviks. Some candidates may compare and contrast Marxist ideology with the actual experience of life in the USSR. Candidates are likely to compare the impact of industrialization on the lives of the people, both before and after 1917. Similarities could include the grim experience of industrialization experienced by the proletariat, both as a consequence of Witte’s ‘Great Spurt’ and Stalin’s Five Year Plans. Candidates may wish to compare the scale of the suffering under Lenin and Stalin with that experienced before 1917. Candidates may argue that the working peoples gained benefits from Soviet rule, for example in the sphere of education. Candidates are likely to limit their evaluation of life for the proletariat under the Tsars from around 1890 as there were comparatively few urban workers prior to Witte’s ‘Great Spurt’. However, some candidates may deal with the whole period from 1855 as there were serfs working in factories prior to Emancipation in 1861. Candidates may treat Russia’s peasants as **part** of their discussions as the growing proletariat consisted largely

of urbanised peasants, but the main focus should involve a consideration of the experience of Russia's industrial working class or proletariat and candidates who fail to discuss the industrial and urban workers should **not** be put into **Levels (i) or (ii) or (iii)** .

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

12 'Opposition to Russian governments was ineffective in the period from 1855 to 1964.' How far do you agree with this view? [60]

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period. Candidates should focus on the phrase 'opposition to Russian governments was ineffective' in their answers. Candidates may argue that for much of the period this view can be justified. In support they are likely to cite examples such as Stalinist terror, Lenin's victory in the Civil War and crushing of the Kronstadt Uprising and the silencing of opposition under Alexander III. Candidates may also argue that the crushing of the 1905 Revolution illustrates this view. However many candidates may argue that opposition under the Tsars was increasingly effective. This can be supported in the reign of Alexander II by the emergence of a wide range of opposition groups such as the Narodniks and the Peoples' Will. His assassination may be used to illustrate effective opposition (although some candidates may argue that the only consequence was his replacement by a far more effective autocrat in Alexander III). Candidates may view the reign of Alexander III as a temporary setback to opposition and see the 1905 Revolution as a dress rehearsal and narrow escape for Nicholas II. Candidates may argue that by 1917 opposition groups such as the SRs, the Mensheviks and the Cadets were increasingly effective. Candidates are very likely to support this by reference to the abdication of Nicholas II and consequent end to the Romanov dynasty. Candidates are very likely to argue that in 1917 the Bolsheviks emerged as an extremely effective opposition group and are likely to support this by reference to the roles of Lenin and Trotsky. Candidates may argue that under communism opposition was much less effective. They are likely to understand that Lenin's banning of factions and Stalin's terror led to a situation when opposition even within the communist party was perilous! Candidates may argue that 'the Thaw' under Khrushchev led to a situation where within the party opposition could flourish; they may well use Khrushchev's enforced resignation to support this argument.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

Theme 5: Civil rights in the USA 1865 – 1992**13 Assess the importance of the federal government in the advancement of African American civil rights in the period from 1865 to 1992.**

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the whole period.

Most candidates will accept that the Federal government was crucial to the advancement of African American civil rights and observe that the 1950s and 1960s witnessed the most significant period of progress for the civil rights of African Americans with the passage by Congress of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, both supported by the president, and that these advances occurred while the Supreme Court was also supportive (for example, in the Brown Case in 1954 and the Browder versus Gayle verdict in 1956 on the Montgomery bus boycott). They will possibly also refer to the period of Reconstruction (1865-1877) as another period in which Congress enacted significant advances (the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments and the Civil Rights Act of 1866), with better candidates pointing out that these were not sustained because President Johnson and the Supreme Court were hostile. They might also contrast these periods with 1877 to 1941 when, without Federal government support, civil rights made little progress and the period from 1970 onwards when Republican presidents, Nixon, Ford, Reagan and Bush, gave at best, lukewarm support, and sometimes not even that. They will probably be aware of the changed attitude of the Supreme Court, contrasting the Plessy versus Ferguson verdict of 1896 with the Brown Case of 1954. Probably only the best candidates will discuss the implications of either the 1978 Bakke Case for affirmative action or the more conservative tone of the Rehnquist court after 1986. Better candidates will attempt to evaluate the importance of the Federal government in relation to other factors. They will be aware that, even when sympathetic to civil rights, the president and Congress were reluctant to act unless put under pressure by activists and protestors. They will point out that civil rights could be seen as making progress ahead of Federal government action because grass roots protest (and, in the post war period, a more sympathetic climate) were essential prerequisites to legislative change. They will also be aware that the huge economic and social changes brought about by the Depression and the Second World War undermined the ability of the Southern states to resist change.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

14 'The actions of Native Americans themselves contributed nothing to the advancement of their civil rights in the period from 1865 to 1992.' To what extent do you agree with this view?

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the whole period.

Most candidates are likely to agree that the majority of Native Americans did little towards the attainment of their civil rights. They will argue that the Federal government did much more than Native Americans themselves to advance their civil rights. The weakest candidates are likely to resort to narrative, chronological exposition of Federal policy beginning with the period of forced assimilation that began with the 1887 Dawes Act. They will regard Collier and the Indian New Deal as a brief period of enlightened Federal policy which was followed by a return to forced assimilation under the policy of termination. Most candidates will be familiar with the high-profile activities of 'Red Power' in the late 1960s and early 1970s (the occupation of Alcatraz in 1969, the occupation of the BIA in 1972, and the protest at Wounded Knee in 1973). They may conclude that this Indian activism (together with the impact of the African American civil rights campaigns) resulted in the

reluctant redress of some Native American grievances, though some candidates will argue that these actions did no more than raise the profile of Indians. Good candidates might consider the Indian Wars of the late 19th century as evidence of Native Americans attempting, though ultimately unsuccessfully, to defend their rights. High ability candidates will show the importance of this struggle in creating sympathy for Native Americans some 80 years later. Good candidates will also be aware that the significant contribution of Native Americans to the US war effort in the two world wars influenced subsequent Federal policy (the granting of US citizenship in 1924 and the formation of the Indian Claims Commission in 1946). The best candidates will be aware of the activities of the various Indian groups, the Society of American Indians (SAI, established in 1911), the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI, established in 1944) and the American Indian Movement (AIM, established in 1968) to preserve Indian customs and culture and exert pressure on Federal and state authorities. High ability candidates will also be able to evaluate the impact of these groups and show that, though they neither exercised much political power nor mobilised mass protest, their activities both influenced, and were encouraged by, sympathetic Federal officials (John Collier in the 1930s and 1940s) and policies (the Indian Claims Commission). They will also be able to show that Native Americans were able to exercise a significant, though limited, negative impact on Federal policy: both the Indian New Deal and the termination policy of the 1950s were abandoned in part because of Indian hostility. High ability candidates might also point out the lack of clarity about what Native American civil rights actually are. They will be aware of the impact of economic and social changes of the mid to late 20th century on Native Americans. Some wanted recognition of their separate culture and traditions while others, particularly those who have moved to the cities and/or intermarried, wished to assimilate into mainstream US culture and overcome de facto racial prejudice over such issues as employment and housing. Such candidates might also analyse the lack of consistency in Federal Indian policy and will be able to discuss the current legal and economic status of the reservations.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

15 How far do you agree that divisions within the women's movement were the most important factor hindering the attainment of gender equality in the USA in the period from 1865 to 1992?

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the whole period.

Most candidates will be aware of the different, and sometimes competing, women's organisations. They will refer to the different strategies adopted by the NWSA and the AWSA (both founded in 1869) and to the founding in 1913 of the militant Congressional Union. However, they may balance this by pointing out that the NWSA and the AWSA merged (as the NAWSA) in 1890 and may attribute the passage of the 19th Amendment in 1920 (which granted women the vote nationally) to the campaigning of the NAWSA and the Congressional Union. They might characterise the women's suffrage movement (as well as the temperance campaigners and those agitating for Progressive Era social and economic reform) as essentially middle class and they should also be aware of divisions among women over race. Black women were excluded from the NAWSA (and so formed their own campaign group) and Elizabeth Stanton opposed allowing blacks to vote. White women were heavily represented in the membership of the revived KKK in the 1920s. Some women opposed the post-war civil rights movement for its failure to campaign for women's issues. Most candidates should be aware of the divisions over abortion (Roe versus Wade, 1973) and the role of Phyllis Schlafly in opposing the Equal Rights Amendment.

Weak candidates will probably not get much further than outlining the divisions within the women's movement, but better candidates should be able to weigh up the importance of these divisions in relation to other factors. They could refer to the impact of economic and technological change (the development of factory work, the typewriter, the expansion of retail trade in the late 19th century and the development of domestic appliances in the 20th century) in changing women's lives and prospects. They could also refer to the power of male opposition to gender equality, initially in resisting female suffrage, but also in trade unions. The ablest candidates may also be aware that some advances in gender equality had little to do with women's agency. The granting of female suffrage in certain western states (eg Colorado in 1893, Idaho in 1896, Washington in 1910 and California in 1911) had more to do with encouraging westward migration than enlightened attitudes to women's roles in society. Similarly, after the Second World War, some Southerners advocated women's rights as a tactic to divide, and thus defeat, the civil rights campaign. High level answers might also discuss the nature of women's rights and point out the lack of unity about what gender equality means in practice.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

Theme 6: The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868 – 1997**16 How far was the extension to the franchise in 1918 the most important factor in the development of democracy from 1868 to 1997?**

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the whole period.

Candidates could make a strong case for the Representation of the People's Act of 1918 being the most important factor. Not only did women get the vote for the first time (over 8.4 million over the age of 30), but the total electorate was increased to over 21 million (all men over the age of 21 were given the vote). However, many responses are likely to indicate the limited nature of this change, in so far as many women were debarred as a result of the age limit. It might also be argued that the legislation was a logical (and inevitable?) development from franchise reforms that had occurred in the nineteenth century. Moreover, the weaknesses of 1918 were partly addressed by the Equal Franchise Act of 1928, when all women over 21 were given the vote, and the Representation of the People Act of 1969, which reduced the voting age of all to 18. Therefore, 1918 was part of a chain of events that led to a fairer and more equal democratic system.

Some candidates will make a case for other factors constituting major influences. These might include the Ballot Act (1872), the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act (1883), the Redistribution of Seats Act (1885) and the Parliament Act (1911). Others might consider events of a more general nature, such as the formation of the Labour party, the emergence of general unions, the rise of the mass media and the influence of the Suffragettes. Such an approach is unlikely to be as successful as that which focuses on a particular reform or event, as it would be more difficult to measure the degree of change that occurred.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

17 Assess why the Conservatives were more successful than any other party in staying in power from 1868 to 1997.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the whole period.

Candidates may argue that the answer relates primarily to ideological differences. The Conservatives consistently promoted law and order, the Church of England, paternalism, protectionism, property rights and nationalism, all of which had a general appeal to an ever increasing electorate. This seemed to marry well with a deep seated conservatism that remained part of the British psyche and culture throughout the period.

With the Liberals there seemed to be less ideological consistency and congruence, with a shift from so called 'old liberalism' to 'new liberalism' by the end of the nineteenth century. This was partly in response to an attempt to capture the votes of the newly enfranchised working classes. However, the emergence of the Labour party seemed to damage Liberal aspirations considerably, whilst the Conservatives maintained a steady level of appeal. However, Labour also went through major changes with respect to ideology and policy especially under Blair. This, of course, helped Labour achieve huge political success in the latter part of the period

Other factors should also be discussed, such as leadership differences, party organisation and unity, and contingency factors (eg wars, economic conditions, social changes). Better candidates will take heed of the command stem and ensure that they make a judgement

about the relative importance of reasons for the differing fortunes of the main political parties.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

18 'Trade Unions held back the development of democracy from 1868 to 1997.' How far do you agree?

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the whole period.

A case could be made for the role Trades Unions played in hindering attempts to increase freedom of choice (if that is how democracy is to be defined). There is likely to be a focus on the more frequent use of strikes and on a bigger scale, which resulted in restraint of trade. Examples to illustrate this could be taken from across the period and might include the late 1880s, 1912, 1926, 1972-74 and 1984-85. For many sectors of the population, restraint of trade meant restricted consumer choice, inconvenience and unnecessary hardship. There was also the more specific issue of the closed shop, which until the end of the period, could be seen as anti-democratic by restricting worker choice of who should best represent their interests in the work place.

Many responses are likely to suggest that the existence of unions, particularly those that were 'responsible', enhanced the democratic process. They acted as successful pressure groups and a check on the power of central governments and their relationship with the Labour party aided more effective, appropriate and widespread representation of the interests of working people. Furthermore, they had a positive impact on economic and social policies (especially in the areas of health and education).

The best responses should provide balance. Some candidates may comment on the Whiggish tone of the question and how it implies that democracy triumphed despite the odd obstruction.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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