GCE

History A

Advanced GCE

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

Mark Scheme for June 2011

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	• 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. **18-20**	• 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 **36-40**
Level IB	**Level IB** • 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 **16-17**	• 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 **32-35**
Level II	• 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 **14-15**	• 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 **28-31**

Level III	• 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 **12-13**	• 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 **24-27**
Level IV	• 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 **10-11**	• 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 **20-23**
Level V	• 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 **8-9**	• 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 **16-19**

Level VI	- 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 **4-7**	- 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 **8-15**
Level VII	- Little relevant or accurate knowledge - Very fragmentary and disorganised response - Very poor use of English and some incoherence **0-3**	- 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 **0-7**

1   **Assess the view that German nationalism lacked popular appeal in the period from 1789 to 1919.** **[60]**

Candidates should focus on 'German nationalism' and 'popular appeal' in their answers in an attempt to assess the appeal of nationalism in this period. Candidates should evaluate the extent to which nationalism had popular 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 - 19. 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.

2   **'Bismarck's appointment as minister president of Prussia in 1862 was the most important turning-point in the course of German nationalism.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1789 to 1919?** **[60]**

Candidates should focus on the phrase 'most important turning point' in their answers. Candidates may argue either for or against the appointment of Bismarck as minister president of Prussia in 1862 as the most important turning point, but must do so comparatively in the context of other turning points. Any answers that are limited to the importance of the appointment of Bismarck as minister president of Prussia in 1862, however full and accurate, are likely to be imbalanced. In assessing the significance of the appointment of Bismarck as minister president of Prussia in 1862 candidates are likely to stress his impact on events in the period from 1862 to 1870 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

1792	The start of the Revolutionary Wars
1813	Napoleon's defeat at the battle of Leipzig (the Battle of the Nations)
1815	Congress of Vienna – formation of German Confederation
1848-49	Defeat of the Revolution(s)
1866	Seven Weeks War – the defeat of Austria
1870/71	The Franco – Prussian War and formation of the Second Reich (German Empire)
1888	Accession of Wilhelm II
1890	Sacking of Bismarck
1914	Start of the First World War
1918	Defeat in the First World War

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. Candidates may also choose to compare Bismarck with other individuals.

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

3   **Assess the view that the German nation was just as divided from 1871 to 1919 as it was from 1789 to 1870.**   **[60]**

Candidates should focus on the extent to which the German people were more united in the period following the creation of the Second Reich than they were up to 1870. There are many possible approaches to this question as candidates may consider unity territorially and / or politically and / or economically and / or socially. Candidates may argue both for and against this proposition. Candidates may understand that the Prussian Empire in 1871 represented Kleindeutschland and was an enlarged Prussia. They may argue that it was a Prussian Empire rather than a German Empire; it certainly did not unite all the German people even geographically. The exclusion of Austria from the process of German unification may be dealt with, though candidates may refer to Bismarck's creation of the Dual Alliance as significant. Divisions within the German Nation after 1871 might be illustrated through the Kulturkampf and the rise of socialism, or the domination of the Reich by the elites. However, candidates may also argue that territorial boundaries rarely exactly match where the people of that nationality live and that divisions within a nation based on class or culture do not necessarily define the unity or otherwise of that nation. All modern nations have exhibited such divisions. They could certainly argue that the German Empire from 1871 physically united the majority of Germans. Candidates may argue that the German nation achieved a form of unity under the domination of Napoleon and through the creation of the Confederation of the Rhine. Germany was then certainly very divided from 1815 as a consequence of decisions taken at the Congress of Vienna, though it could also be argued that the German Confederation from 1815 loosely bound most Germans into a Confederation with a Diet. Candidates may also make the point that from 1866 the vast majority of German states were already united behind the leadership of Prussia. Candidates may argue that the development of more radical nationalism in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Century demonstrates an emergence of greater national unity amongst the German people during this period. Candidates may argue that the First World War united the German nation at first but that divisions soon arose and were entrenched by 1918. Similarly, whilst Versailles divided the nation geographically it united the nation in condemnation and bitterness of the 'diktat'.

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

4   **'Armies were led by incompetent generals.' To what extent do you agree with this view of the period from 1792 to 1945?**   **[60]**

Examples of incompetent generals in the period are legion but specific examples might be Mack, Brunswick in 1806, Raglan, McClellan, Benedek or Bazaine.
Examples of competent generals that might be used to challenge the proposition are Napoleon, Wellington, Lee, Grant, Sherman, Moltke the Elder, Montgomery, Eisenhower, von Manstein, Guderian, Zhukov or Slim. Some candidates may refer to generals who have been the subject of revision; an obvious example might be Haig.

We might expect discussion of quality of leadership: control and application of strategy and tactics, an ability to respond positively to the changing demands of warfare in the period (new technologies, transport systems, etc.), the skill to motivate other officers and men, broad vision, willingness to delegate and to be flexible. Other factors may be included in the essay but the key prompt of the question must be at the core of the response. Where other factors are linked directly and intelligently to the specific wording of the question then credit is due. Candidates might discuss the role of luck, fog of war, problems created by incompetent subordinates. The incompetence or competence of a general might be discussed in the context of the changing nature of warfare and, indeed, this might be the mark of a high quality response.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

5   **'The development of the Prussian general staff during the Wars of German Unification was the main turning point in the conduct of war.' How far do you agree with this view in the period from 1792 to 1945?**   **[60]**

Candidates may argue for the turning point because it was only in the wars of 1866 and 1870-1 that the Prussians had fully developed their general staff concept and applied it to the planning and control of warfare. Key ideas for discussion might be the development of a meritocratic, professional and properly trained officer corps, higher army organisation, the mobilisation and control of mass armies, the development of general staffs, the planning of campaigns (military concentration, speed of movement, control of corps etc.), and the search for rapid and decisive victory. This list is not exhaustive.

A positive answer might concentrate on the rise of Prussian styles of warfare and would use evidence from the Austro-Prussian and Franco-Prussian Wars. Candidates might argue that this Prussian style of higher command then dominated warfare until the end of the period. Alternative turning points might be the Revolutionary and Napoleonic periods with the development of Napoleon's headquarters and allied attempts to copy them during those conflicts; the planning & preparation by the Great Powers for WWI. The American Civil War could be used either way, pointing to American armies copying & developing European styles of war or pointing to a general state of disorder. Candidates might point to the links between technology and command and control in WWII as the real turning point.

Alternatively, the concept of turning point might be rejected altogether, rather planning and preparation for war was part of an ongoing process.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

6   **'Developments in weaponry revolutionised warfare.' To what extent do you agree with this view of the period from 1792 to 1945?**   **[60]**

Candidates should focus on the concept of revolution in the development of warfare.

Two common lines of argument might be expected, either developments in weaponry did revolutionise warfare or did not. A third position might be to question the extent of such a revolution at different points in the period, perhaps arguing that warfare changed far more as weapons development increased in tempo.

The first line of argument might point to the development of longer range and more rapid firing weapons and the impact this had on battlefield formations, the deployment and manoeuvre of bodies of troops. Candidates might use examples of developments in weaponry across a very short period of time, for example the use of breech loading needle guns against muzzle loading muskets in the 1866 war, or compare one end of the period to the other. A variety of weaponry could be deployed in support of the debate, artillery, small arms etc, but the synoptic nature of the assessment should be at the core of the argument.

A counter argument might concentrate on the nature of warfare and an argument that at a very basic level there was considerable continuity in warfare. This type of response might use military theory as the basis for the debate, for example the use of concentration of force, surprise, etc.

Alternatively, candidates might argue that battle tactics did not keep up with developments in weapons technology. Indeed, much of the modern literature points to essentially Napoleonic tactics being used until very late in the period. The American Civil War fits neatly into this debate.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

7   How effective was revolutionary nationalism in Ireland in the period from 1798 to 1921?   [60]

Candidates may argue that revolutionary nationalism was mainly ineffective until 1916, and that many republicans even viewed the years from 1917 to 1921 as a failure since Ireland experienced civil war, an imposed Anglo-Irish Treaty and partition. However they will need to establish criteria for effectiveness, not least the **achievement of aims**. Here they failed throughout the period but they were able to mobilise large numbers on occasions (in 1798, during the Tithe War in the 1830s, in the agrarian outrages and land war of the 1880s, in the western parts of Ireland in the 1890s – O'Brien, and post 1916). They certainly changed British government policy after the Wolfe Tone Rising of 1798, after 1867, 1881 and again after the Easter Rising of 1916. They **staged rebellions** throughout the period, maintaining an effective 'blood sacrifice' (Emmet in 1803, Young Ireland in the 1840s, the Fenians and the IRB). Candidates could assess their **leadership** and may well conclude that it was ineffective prior to 1916, although Davitt successfully harnessed agrarian violence to nationalist ends and Tone, Emmet and O'Brien all managed heroic personal stands. Candidates could usefully evaluate any of the risings to illustrate inadequate arming, poor organisation and lack of an over-arching plan. Wolfe Tone or the Easter Rising of 1916 are good examples of this. More effective were De Valera and Collins post 1916. Much would be dependent on **externalities** like war (Napoleonic and 1st World War), foreign aid and support (France and Germany), Famine, the impact of the Diaspora (the Fenians and the US), agrarian crisis and the impact of Parliamentary Reform (in 1850, 1884-5 and 1918). The resolution of such events could rob the revolutionary nationalists of effectiveness. This could also be conditioned by the **strategies** adopted, usually based on a rising, which were poorly organised and easily put down, although violence could put Ireland onto the British agenda (the Fenians in 1867). Up to 1918 the secrecy adopted robbed them of the ability to organise large numbers, unless they used agrarian issues (Davitt and O'Brien). In contrast to Constitutional Nationalism an electoral strategy was only fully adopted in 1918 which, combined with absenteeism from Westminster was very effective. This political strategy was combined with a much more effective military one; not the single heroic rising of the 19th century but owing more to agrarian wars, in combination with passive resistance, boycotts and rural guerrilla warfare. This targeted the police and British Intelligence (Bloody Sunday) and provoked an unacceptable reaction from the British authorities (the Black and Tans and Croke Park). It used assassinations, terrorising local communities into non assistance and effectively using local government to set up a 'state within a state' to control land and administration outside the large towns. From the 1890s the Gaelic revival was used by some to achieve cultural independence (Pearse). **British governments** also determined, through their response, how effective revolutionary nationalists could be eg their over- reaction post 1916, in contrast to 1798 (very bloody but in a different context) and the 19th century.

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

**8   How far did support for the Union change within Ireland in the period from 1800 to
        1921?   [60]**

The focus is on support in Ireland, although reference can be made, where appropriate, to
Britain given the links between the Protestant Ascendancy and Ulster Unionism and
mainland political parties. British governments certainly hoped to build Irish support for the
Union and indeed sought to govern Ireland through the Ascendancy until at least the
1880s. The Ascendancy was their main instrument in the first half of the 19th century,
controlling patronage, politics, land and religion. The mass of the people may have been
indifferent to the Union post 1800, except in a religious and economic sense, presenting
little threat to the Ascendancy. The latter initially had mixed feelings about the Union,
feeling the loss of Grattan's Patriot Parliament. Their Protestant Irish nationalism began
the 19th century on the back foot but they adjusted and took full advantage of Westminster,
supporting coercion in the 1820s and 1830s. Emancipation challenged its political and
religious dominance in the long term, although both the Whigs and Peel were reassuring in
practice, punishing freeholders who had rebelled electorally in the late 1820s. There was
little change here until the 1860s when Butt began to organise a separate political identity
amongst Irish MPs to push for a return of a Dublin Parliament. The other area of support
was Ulster but its nature and nationalism was different – middle and working class rather
than aristocratic and gentry based, more confident, based on Presbyterianism rather than
Anglicanism, boosted by industrial expansion and proceeding via the exclusion of
Catholics from employment. It was less high profile before the 1880s but it too worried
about Whig deals with O'Connell and Peelite and Gladstonian attempts to woo the Catholic
Church, the mid century revival of which put Union Anglicanism and Presbyterianism on
the defensive. The reaction of some of the Ascendancy was to back the Home Rule
initiatives of Butt and Parnell, both from the Ascendancy, or to support devolved power like
Plunkett towards the end of the century. Candidates may well argue that the 1880s were
the turning point in changing the main base of support for the Union from the Ascendancy
towards the Ulster Unionists. The former turned to Home Rule within the Union as their
preferred solution but were undermined by government, economically through Land reform
and the Agricultural Depression and politically through local government devolution in the
1880s and 1890s. They were replaced by a neutral or more pro nationalist class of
Catholic Tenant Farmers whose loyalties were there to be won. Trenchant support for the
Union passed to Ulster which took a hard line on resistance to Home Rule and defence of
the status quo. It developed strong links with the Conservatives from 1886 (Churchill and
the Orange Card) and organised along sectarian lines (Carson and Craig, the Solemn
League and Covenant and the UVF), especially in the 1910s. Such Union support was of a
very different type – sectarian, radical in organisation and willing to defend the Union, or at
least Ulster, along para-military lines against nationalists and British governments and,
given its regional rather than national base, prepared ultimately to accept Partition and
Home Rule for itself 1918-21. There is thus a considerable change in the class basis and
regional nature of support for the Union over the period and in the tactics adopted at any
given time (support and/or opposition to governments and their Irish initiatives).

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

9	**To what extent did the Famine of 1845-9 change the Irish economy in the period from 1798 to 1921?**										**[60]**

Candidates will need to address the broad direction of Irish economic development over the period to assess the extent of change occasioned by the Famine. Economically did it markedly change the Irish export of labour, the tendency to subsistence agriculture alongside larger estates, the decline of the Cottier class and the rise of a more substantial Catholic tenant farmer and the development of Industries in the North East (linen, shipbuilding and engineering)? Economically famines were not unusual (severe in the 1810s) and more substantial tenant farmers were already emerging. The Devon Commission, called before the Famine, concluded small plots were unsustainable. It could be argued the Famine merely hastened the land shake-up. Similarly emigration and labour export was well underway before the famine (1½ million leaving between 1815 and 1845). The West remained poor both before and after the famine. However some may stress change, particularly in reference to the scale of the disaster, citing the large drop in population and the arrest in the burgeoning figures of the 1770-1840 period (3 to 8 to 6 million). The Cottier class was wiped out along with seasonal unemployment. The potato declined in relative importance. Larger tenant farmers slowly began to modernise, move towards pastoral farming and government became more interventionist via public works, workhouses, Land sales, (Encumbered Estates Act 1849), and ultimately effective land reform. Evictions increased and tenant rights became politically more central in Anglo – Irish relationships. Ulster was less affected by the famine and the cities were more affected by the Cholera epidemic of 1849-50. Emigration was of the poorer type and it remained high throughout the period (2½ million 1850-1921). Arguably the Agricultural Depression was of similar gravity.

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

10   Assess the view that the condition of the peasantry in Russia was transformed in the period from 1855 to 1964.   [60]

Candidates should focus on the similarities and differences between the condition of the peasantry and the treatment that the peasants received, both before and after 1917. Transformed is the key word in this title; candidates may well consider how valid this premise is. Candidates may well argue against the condition of the peasantry being transformed. It could be argued that the peasantry made little progress in many ways during this period and that predominantly their living and working conditions remained bleak. Peasants were only serfs under the Romanovs, but some candidates may argue that there was little real improvement and / or that collectivization was a 'second serfdom'. Before and after 1917 there was harsh treatment of the peasantry by both regimes; in both periods they were 'squeezed dry' to finance industrialization. Famine hit, e.g. 1891, 1921 & 1932, regardless of regime, although arguably Stalin's denial of the famine of the 1930s made its impact worse. Control over their lives, whether exercised through the Mir, the Land Captains or the Kolkhoz was a common feature, although distinctions may clearly be made. However there were periods of reform both before and after 1917 that should enable candidates to successfully support the view in the question. The peasants were given glimpses of reform, e.g. Emancipation in 1861, the Peasants Land Bank from the 1880s, the Decree on Land in 1917 and the NEP from 1921. All of these changes led to improvements, although some were temporary, in their living and working conditions. Both regimes had a temporary Kulak policy under Stolypin from 1906 & under the NEP from 1921-28 as peasants were encouraged to 'enrich themselves'. Arguably the communists did much more to introduce social reform, for example in the sphere of education, than the Tsars. Candidates may argue that whilst some peasants suffered dreadfully under Stalin because of collectivisation and de-kulakisation the survivors had significantly better health care and education than their predecessors. And their prospects were further enhanced by Khrushchev's Virgin Lands Scheme.

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

11   'The communist rulers were effective autocrats; the Tsars were not.' How far do you agree with this view of Russian government in the period from 1855 to 1964?   [60]

Candidates should focus on the relative effectiveness of the communists and the Romanov Tsars as autocratic or dictatorial rulers of Russia. Candidates are likely to define their criteria for assessing the effectiveness of Russian rulers in this period and will then judge the rulers against them. The following list is not exclusive but obvious criteria might include the extent of the ruler's personal power and authority and how effectively they dealt with opposition, the extent to which they successfully implemented their policies or the extent to which they were able to develop the power and international standing of the Russian state. Candidates can be expected to refer to the Okhrana, OGPU, NKVD, KGB and other secret services. Candidates who do not restrict themselves to a narrow definition of effectiveness are likely to be more successful! Candidates may well choose predominantly to concentrate on a comparison between the Tsars and the communists as rulers, but candidates may make comparisons between the individual rulers within each period. When arguing in support of the view in the question, candidates are likely to argue that Lenin and Stalin were 'effective autocrats'. Lenin seized power in 1917 and successfully defended his revolution during the Civil War. Other parties were all banned, as were factions within the Communist Party. Candidates could argue that Stalin was even more effective, for example arguing that his economic policies in the 1930s enabled the USSR to successfully survive Barbarossa and emerge victorious in the Great Fatherland War. Candidates may argue that his 'effectiveness' was achieved at horrific expense and with needless brutality. Candidates are also likely to argue in support of the view in the question that neither Alexander II nor Nicholas II were 'effective autocrats' – the former was faced with a rising

tide of opposition from the early 1870s whilst the latter was forced to abdicate in 1917 and butchered the following year with the rest of his family. Candidates may argue that Alexander II was effective because of the successful implementation of sweeping reforms, for example emancipation of the serfs, in the 1860s. When arguing against the view in the question, candidates are likely to be able to differentiate between the relative effectiveness of the individual Tsars. Candidates may well see Alexander III as an effective autocrat, although it can be argued that his repressive and reactionary policies were effective in the short-term but, as Trotsky put it, 'bequeathed a revolution' to his son and successor, Nicholas II. Candidates may argue that Alexander III achieved very little for Russia or his dynasty despite his apparent reassertion of autocratic control. Candidates may also argue that Khrushchev was far from an 'effective autocrat' using his overthrow and forced retirement in 1964 and the failure of policies such as the Virgin Lands scheme as obvious examples.

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

12   **'All Russia's rulers tried to modernise Russia.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1855 to 1964?   [60]**

Candidates should focus on the phrases 'all Russia's rulers' and 'tried to modernise Russia' in their answers. 'All' and 'tried' are key words that most successful answers are likely to address. Candidates should argue both for and against the view in the question. Candidates may argue that all of Russia's rulers modernised Russia using examples such as those that follow:

Alexander II	Emancipation of the serfs and other reforms (e.g. Zemstva and Trial by Jury)
Alexander III	Peasants Land Bank / appointed Witte (start of his 'Great Spurt')
Nicholas II	Witte's Great Spurt / the October Manifesto of 1905 / Stolypin's Reforms
Provisional Gov.	Planned democratisation
Lenin	Decree on Land / War Communism / NEP
Stalin	Five Year Plans and Collectivisation
Khrushchev	Secret Speech / Virgin Lands / Space Race

Some candidates may focus on the social changes such as education, health, housing, religion and the position of women in society.

Clearly answers of the very highest quality can be written without considering all of these events, but the most able candidates will demonstrate a breadth of vision and a good understanding of the ways in which most rulers tried to modernise Russia. However, the assertion that all rulers tried to modernise Russia will be challenged by most candidates. When arguing against this view, candidates may argue that neither Alexander II nor Nicholas II tried to modernise Russia. They are likely to focus on their determination to uphold autocracy, the influence of Pobeodonotsev and his desire to keep 'Russia in a frozen state'. They may argue that the appointment of Witte by Alexander III and the continuation of the Great Spurt under Nicholas II were purely because of the need to modernise the Russian Armed forces and that any other aspects of modernisation were unintended by-products. Candidates may argue that some rulers were at times forced into modernising policies because of adverse circumstances, eg the Crimean War or the Russo-Japanese War, or to ensure their regime's survival. Candidates may argue that Nicholas II was not trying to modernise Russia when introducing reforms from 1905; he was simply trying to keep his throne. Some candidates may also challenge the motives of other rulers when modernising; for example they may argue that the maintenance of autocracy was a key driver in Alexander II's decision to emancipate the serfs and that most of his other social reforms had to be implemented once the serfs were no longer under the jurisdiction of the landowners. Some candidates may argue that the short-lived Provisional

Government may have intended to modernise Russia but fell because it singularly failed to do so.

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

13   **Assess the view that the quality of leadership shown by African American campaigners was the most important factor in the advancement of their civil rights in the period from 1865 to 1992.   [60]**

Candidates will probably endorse the view that leadership was decisive and focus their attention on the inspirational, non-violent campaigns of Martin Luther King and his ability to win mass (including white) support, national media attention and international recognition. They will probably refer to the bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama in 1956, his leadership of the SCLC, his campaign to desegregate Birmingham, Alabama in 1963 which influenced JFK to introduce the Civil Rights Bill, his speech at the Lincoln Memorial in the Washington March in 1963 and his Selma march in 1965 to pressure LBJ into persuading Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act.

Candidates may also refer to the value of the leadership of Booker T Washington in championing African American economic rights and the importance of the Tuskegee Institute in providing education and training. Candidates may wish to contrast him with his critic, WEB du Bois, and outline the latter's importance in asserting uncompromising opposition to black inferiority and his importance in helping to establish the NAACP. Better answers might analyse the crucial importance of the NAACP strategy of challenging segregation in the courts and explain the importance of the 1954 Brown decision. Candidates might refer to Marcus Garvey's influence in helping African Americans to rediscover and take pride in their heritage. A. Philip Randolph's campaign to end discrimination in federal employment in the 1940s and Malcolm X's inspirational work with the Nation of Islam in the 1950s and early 1960s may also be mentioned. Some candidates may suggest that, after the death of Luther King in 1968, African-Americans lacked effective leadership, though they might discuss Jesse Jackson's unsuccessful bids to win the Democratic presidential nomination in 1984 and 1988.

Better candidates should be aware of the need to evaluate the importance of leadership in relation to other factors. They may be aware that leadership could only be effective when there were large numbers of followers willing to risk their livelihoods, and even their lives, by campaigning for civil rights. The best answers may point out that the absence of such grass-roots activism helps to explain why Booker T Washington or WEB du Bois could achieve less than Luther King, he had his leadership failures, for example at Albany in 1961-2. Candidates might also be aware that, to achieve legislative change, the Civil Rights campaign needed the support of the Federal government, pointing not only to the Civil Rights Act (1964) and the Voting Rights Act (1965) as evidence, but also observing that Civil Rights made less progress under Republican presidents Nixon, Reagan and Bush.

The best candidates will perhaps be aware that leadership was one of a number a crucial factors necessary to the advancement of civil rights: an intellectual climate sympathetic to African-American aspirations, support from the three branches of the Federal government, a strong grass-roots movement and a clear, obtainable set of goals. They may be aware that these five factors came together only in the early 1960s. The absence of one, or more, of these factors explains the relative lack of progress of African-American civil rights in the years before 1960 and after 1965.

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

14   'Gaining the vote in Federal elections in 1920 was the most important turning-point
      in the campaign for gender equality in the USA'. How far do you agree with this view
      of the period from 1865 to 1992?   [60]

The 19th Amendment can be seen as a turning-point in allowing women full participation in
political life. Candidates might contrast 1865, when women could not vote, with the end of
the period when, in 1984, Geraldine Ferraro was the vice-presidential Democratic
candidate and there were significant (though small) numbers of women in Congress. They
may refer to the "flappers" of the 1920s as evidence of a greater sense of liberation among
women (from the middle class, at least) perhaps attributable to the achievement of the vote
and point out that Frances Perkins became the first female member of the Cabinet as
Secretary of Labor only 13 years after the 19th Amendment and that FDR's New Deal
legislation advanced a number of women's causes. They might regard the 19th
Amendment as evidence of the success of women's activism and see it as inspiring later
campaigns on other issues.

Some candidates will wish to challenge whether 1920 can be seen as a turning-point,
perhaps pointing out that the vote had been granted in nearly half (20/48) of the states
before 1920. They may also observe that the 19th Amendment had no impact on black
women in the Jim Crow south and that gaining the vote had been an objective of mainly
middle class women. The better candidates may observe that the vote made no real
difference to women's other, arguably more important, concerns such as education, job
opportunities, working conditions, and earnings and point out that, after 1920, opinion
among women over the ERA become more polarised.

Candidates should compare 1920 with other potential turning-points. These might include
either of the two world wars which expanded women's employment and earning power.
Even if these benefits lasted only for the duration of the war, the economic expansion that
occurred in each war widened women's opportunities and horizons and, arguably,
contributed to long-term change in social attitudes. Candidates might also consider the
1960s which saw the expansion of university education and welfare provision, two
important legislative milestones (1963 Equal Pay Act, 1964 Civil Rights Act), the feminist
movement spearheaded by Betty Friedan and the marketing of the contraceptive pill.
Some candidates might argue for the Roe versus Wade Supreme Court decision on
abortion as the turning-point which began the culture wars of the 1970s and 1980s and
stimulated the women's backlash against the ERA led by Phyllis Schlafly.

The best candidates will weigh up the relative merits of the various turning-points. They
may conclude that the relatively limited impact of the 19th Amendment disqualifies it as the
most important turning-point. They might argue that the changes brought about by the
wars were more significant because they affected a wider range of issues and people.
Others will opt for the 1960s as the most significant because the changes were legislative,
educational, economic and social. Furthermore, they were arguably more divisive than the
changes brought about by other turning-points.

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

15   'The policies of the Federal government failed to support the civil rights of Native
      Americans.' To what extent do you agree with this view of the period from 1865 to
      1992?   [60]

Many candidates will wish to agree with this view and discuss the unsympathetic treatment
Native Americans have received from the Federal government. They might mention the
period of the Indian Wars (1860s to 1890) when the aim of the Federal government was to
destroy Native American opposition to white westward expansion, defeat them as a
military threat and subjugate them onto reservations. They may also be familiar with the
Dawes Severalty Act of 1887 which aimed to break up the reservations and turn Native
Americans into self-sufficient farmers. Candidates may also know about the 1903 Supreme
Court decision (*Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock)* that Congress could dispose of Indian land without
gaining the consent of the Indians involved. In this period reformers and educators aimed
to destroy Native American culture and separate identity by 'civilising' them – by converting
them to Christianity and teaching their children in special schools, modelled on the Carlisle
Indian School. Some will be aware that, although the 1924 Citizenship Act granted US
citizenship to all Native Americans who had not already acquired it, Indians were denied
the vote in many Western states by much the same methods as African Americans were
disenfranchised in the South. Candidates will perhaps regard the policy known as
'termination' from 1948 to 1961 as another unsympathetic period when the Federal
government sought to end Federal supervision of the reservations and to 'liberate' Native
Americans by encouraging them to relocate to the cities and assimilate into mainstream
US society. Candidates may well interpret this as another cynical government ploy to seize
Native American land.

In challenging the view that the Federal government was consistently unsympathetic,
candidates may wish to discuss FDR's Indian commissioner, John Collier, who ended the
assimilation policy. The Indian Reorganisation Act of 1934 ended the policy of allotment,
banned the further sale of Indian land and decreed that any unallotted land not yet sold
should be returned to tribal control. It also granted Indian communities a measure of
governmental and judicial autonomy. The IRA was important in arresting the loss of Indian
resources and Collier successfully encouraged a renewed respect for Native American
culture and traditions. Candidates may also wish to argue that, from the 1960s, Federal
policy has been much more supportive of Native American rights. They might point to the
impact of the Red Power movement in drawing national attention to the plight of Indians
and the largely sympathetic response in a series of measures including the 1968 Indian
Civil Rights Act, the 1972 Indian Education Act, the 1975 Indian Self-Determination and
Education Assistance Act and the 1978 American Indian Religious Freedom Act. They
may also be aware of the decisions of the Indian Claims Commission and the Supreme
Court in granting compensation for lost Indian lands and the social, economic and social
impact these have had on some reservations.

The best answers may well be able to point out that Federal policy is complicated by a lack
of clarity about what Native American rights should be and that there is no agreement
among Native Americans about this either. They might point out that some Native
Americans are only too anxious to assimilate, as the opposition of many to the IRA, their
willingness to enlist (especially in World War Two) and the degree of support for
termination demonstrates. Some candidates may point out that Federal policy has been
consistently characterised by paternalism. Both the policy of Federal supervision of the
reservations and the attempts to assimilate Native Americans are founded on the
assumption that WASP culture is superior.

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

16   'The decade from 1910 to 1920 was the most important turning point for the
      development of mass democracy.' How far do you agree with this view of the period
      from 1868 to 1997?   [60]

Candidates could point to the problem of defining mass democracy, certainly in the first
half of the period when it was only partially in place – a universal franchise, popular
electoral methods and systems, a bi- cameral system (one house unelected throughout the
period), recognition of mass numbers, gender issues and minority representation, regional
control, class politics and a recognition of the role of pressure groups. There could be
opposition to some, acceptance of others at various times. Thus by the **1880s** all accepted
the need to change electoral methods – ballot and restrictions on patronage. However
property rights remained the basis of suffrage, Liberals and Conservatives alike fearing the
franchise reaching the residuum. The argument for the importance of the **1910s** is that
before this only Socialists and Labour politicians uniformly argued for mass male suffrage,
yet in 1918 the vote was given to all men over 21. On female suffrage the Conservatives,
who had opposed up to 1916, converted, as did the Liberals and Labour, both formerly
divided. Against the 1910s is that most still favoured the unequal situation on male/female
voting that existed up to 1928. Only a rebalancing of the population and a perception that
women could be conservative led to equality (1928) and a case could be made for the
1920s as being a more important decade for female suffrage. Reform of the Lords also
occurred in 1911. Conservatives had always opposed this, whilst many Liberals were far
from anxious to follow Gladstone over removal of the Lords' veto from 1893 until the 1906 -
11 experience. Since 1911 all parties have been reluctant to reform the power and
composition of the Lords, content to see a gradual change from hereditary aristocrats to
Life Peers up to 1997. Changes to the Commons (Payment of MPs and the move towards
professional rather than amateur representation) were also accepted in the 1910s; Labour
stood most to gain from such measures. Others may argue that mass democracy was a
matter for the **1940s**, thanks to the democratisation of war, rationing, educational change,
health and the high turn-out involved in the 1945 election. A case could also be made for
the **1960s and 1970s** as the most important turning point if one's criteria are youth, gender
and race. Youth were included in the franchise in 1969, whilst minority rights (sexual and
gender) had been opposed by all before the 1960s, Labour politicians being acutely aware
of Union gender prejudice. They took the lead on a more inclusive approach to gay and
female rights, backed by Liberals, in the 1960s and 1970s, although in some areas there
was a Conservative backlash in the 1980s. There was also the debatable extent of Trade
Union power, the 1980s seeing a concern to restrict what was seen as their excessive
power. Candidates should attempt some **overall judgement.** For most it is likely that the
1910s were the crucial decade (franchise and institutional change). On wider and mass
democratic issues the picture is more complex (**the 1940s**), although the **1960s and
1970s** could be seen as crucial for minorities and women.

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

17   **How far did the role of the House of Commons change in the period from 1868 to 1997?**   **[60]**

In some respects candidates could argue that the Commons remained in its format much the same throughout the period but there were significant changes to its **composition** as a result of reform, up to 1918, of the franchise redistribution, methods and patronage. In 1868 most MPs were landed and propertied. They were unpaid until 1911 and inevitably came from backgrounds that could afford to be a part time MP. Most came from rural areas or were men of traditional business, whether Tory or Liberal. From the 1880s business, banking, finance and the professions grew and, from 1900 Trade Union sponsored MPs, working men rising through Union administration or educated professionals also diluted an aristocratic and gentry based Commons. Throughout the 20th century MPs have been predominantly upper middle class, increasingly from a legal background or financial background and male. Women had a minor impact in the 1918-60 periods but then declined until 1997. In terms of its **influence on law and government** it could be argued that it first had to share power with the Lords until 1911, often seeing its legislation delayed or vetoed (1893; 1903-1910), but was also powerful in relation to governments who were reluctant to confront it (as Gladstone did over Home Rule in 1886). This remained the case, outside war time, until 1945, after which governments increasingly controlled timetables and business, whilst legislation increased and the powers of the parties came to restrict the more independent MPs of the 19th and early 20th centuries (the whip system). Nonetheless **governments throughout the period were adept at seeking to control the Commons.** The growth of government however gave it the opportunity to develop more ministerial office and thus the chance to offer promotion to party members. MPs also became more accountable to their constituency parties (rigorous panel interviews and selection committees) and, in the case of many Labour MPs, their Trade Union sponsors. MPs from the 1880s became ever more bound by their party manifestos and the need to campaign amongst a widening electorate. From 1945 they have stood for and won under a party label and discipline. In 1868 many seats remained uncontested but by 1918 almost all were contested, despite their un-winability. MPs could switch allegiance at the beginning of the period but by 1945 this could spell the end of a political career and even Churchill was frowned on in the interwar period for this. Much legislation in 1868 was initiated by individual MPs but this declined steadily throughout the period and had all but disappeared by 1997. There was **little institutional reform** in the period. A guillotine motion was introduced in the early 1880s to stop Irish obstructionism and parliamentary sessions became longer but in procedural terms little changed (a rebuilt Commons post 1945 still lacked seating for all and voting was still in person and done through the lobbies). Until 1995 Debates still started in the afternoon, although the Committee system developed to cope with the increasingly technical nature of legislation. However standing committees have an inbuilt government majority; only select committees can scrutinise governments effectively and their introduction in 1979 was a major reform. The work load is now much greater than before 1945 and debate since the 1880s has become ever more controlled. The issue of Commons corruption has remained a constant, from electoral scandals in the 1880s to the Cash for Questions case in 1994.

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

18   **'The mass media played the most important role in the development of democracy'. How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1868 to 1997?**   **[60]**

The argument that it was the most important factor was that its development preceded many of the key developments such as party organisation and franchise reform. It could be argued that governments noted its impact and sought to exploit it politically or moved to include groups affected by it. Thus the emergence of a powerful provincial middle class press in the 1860s was evidence of political commitment, especially nonconformist and artisan, and franchise and electoral reform followed. The Times could ruin the career of Parnell in the late 1880s. However the more populist press of the 1890s, with its sensationalism, could be seen to have a contrary effect. Balfour and Lord Salisbury were scathing in their view of its readership and it helped to convince them that further democracy should be resisted. The mass media would appear to have little effect on Labour politics and indeed remained its enemy, with the exception of the Daily Herald and later the Daily Mirror until the 1990s. Governments could easily use the press to influence and control public opinion, most obviously during the World Wars, the General Strike in 1926, the Falklands War and the Troubles in Northern Ireland. However it could also hold government to account, as it did in the 1980s (Ponting) and over Suez. However by the 20th century it was rare for democratic change to be pushed by the press on anything major, like gender or minority issues, PR and reform of the Lords or Monarchy. It preferred a single, often personal issue – a government scalp or bureaucratic waste. Nonetheless the rise of the tabloid press in the 1960s was widely held by governments to be crucial during elections, the 'Sun' in particular. Press barons were considered important whether they be Harmsworth, Beaverbrook or Murdoch and the concentration of ownership in the hands of a few is questionable in a democratic sense. Cinema tended to be non-political, its newsreels largely conformist in both war and peace. The radio, and later TV, given its BBC origins in the early 1920s, was more consciously moulding of what it conceived to be British democratic values – fair play, educative in a highbrow sense, informative and grave, at least until the 1950s. Its peculiar Corporative position and monopoly was open to abuse, as in 1926 when Labour and the Archbishop of Canterbury were refused the chance to broadcast. However it was important in creating a sense that Britain upheld democracy in the 1930s and 1940s. In the 1960s and 1970s it and ITV could campaign for the underprivileged (Plays for Today) and it became a crucial medium for democratic politicians to master, although the broadcasting media arguably remained in a cosy relationship with the State and was criticised as such by some. It could also be said that by presenting news in a package it contributed, in the later 20th century, to less political activism than in the pre 1945 period. Nonetheless Channel 4 was established in the 1980s to cater for minority interests, arguably following democratic trends rather than initiating them. Both the BBC and ITC are required to maintain political impartiality. Candidates could argue that other factors were of greater importance, downplaying the media as an influence (it rarely took a mobilising or libertarian role and had always been subject to the tradition of public secrecy, reinforced by acts dating back to 1911) and stressing pressure groups, party competition, education, economic and social factors and war as the determinants in democratic change.

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

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