

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

INSTRUCTIONS ON MARKING SCRIPTS

All page references relate to the Instructions for Examiner booklet (revised September 2008)

For many question papers there will also be subject or paper specific instructions which supplement these general instructions. The paper specific instructions follow these generic ones.

1 Before the Standardisation Meeting

Before the Standardisation Meeting you must mark at least 10 scripts from several Centres. For this preliminary marking you should use a **pencil** and **follow the mark scheme**. Bring these **marked scripts** to the meeting. (*Section 5b, page 5*)

2 Marking and Annotation of scripts after the standardisation meeting

- a) Scripts must be marked in **red**, including those initially marked in pencil for the Standardisation Meeting.
- b) All scripts must be marked in accordance with the version of the mark scheme agreed at the Standardisation Meeting.
- c) **Annotation of scripts**

Examiners should use annotation to show clearly where a mark is earned or why it has not been awarded. This will help Examiners, checkers, and those people who review the marking of scripts.

Annotation consists of:

- ticks and crosses to show where marks have been earned or not earned
- specific words or phrases as agreed at standardisation and as contained and included in the final mark scheme to show why a mark has been earned or indicate why a mark has not been earned (eg to show there is an omission)
- standard abbreviations, eg for follow through, special case etc.

As you may need to return scripts to centres you should use the minimum of comments and make sure that comments are related to the award of a mark or marks and be matched to statements in the mark scheme. Do not include general comments on a candidate's work.

Record any annotations in the body of the answer, or in the margin next to the point where the decision is made to award or not award the mark.
(*Section 9a-b, page 8*)

d) **Recording of Marks**

- i) give a clear indication of how marks have been awarded, as instructed in the mark scheme.
- ii) record numerical marks for responses to part questions **unringed** in the right-hand margin. Show the total for each question (or, in specified cases – for each page) as a single **ringed** mark in the right-hand margin at the end of each question.
- iii) transfer ringed totals to the front page of the script, where they should be totalled.
- iv) show evidence that you have seen the work on every page of a script on which the candidate has made a response.
- v) cross through every blank page to show that you have seen it.
(Section 9c, page 8)

e) **Handling of unexpected answers**

The standardisation meeting will include a discussion of marking issues, including:

- consideration of the mark scheme to reach a decision about the range of acceptable responses and the marks appropriate to them, and comparable marking standards for optional questions, and the handling of unexpected, yet acceptable answers.

(Section 6a, bullet point 5, page 5)

If you are not sure how to apply the mark scheme to an answer, then telephone your Team Leader.

(Appendix 5, para 19, page 28)

GENERIC MARK BANDS

Units 2587-2589: HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Examiners are reminded that

- in Bands I-III they should provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down, while
- in Bands IV-VII they should provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up/down
- are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5].

Answers require some broad understanding of historical debate, but never depend on any reference to the views of particular historians (pertinent references to such will, however, be given credit - as in any AS/A2 Unit). **Demonstration of a broad understanding of historical debate does not involve anything very sophisticated: even hints and fragments of it in an answer will meet the criterion for AO2 and satisfy the demands of the top Bands.**

PASSAGES QUESTION

NB

- Answers which make absolutely no use of/reference to historical debate may NOT be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge may not be put in Band I.
- Answers which use own knowledge but make no use of the Passages may not be put in Bands I or II.
- The quality of English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.
- Glosses in [] have been added to aid “a well-founded and common understanding of the requirements of the mark scheme.” (*Code of Practice*, #4.17).

BANDS I-VII/45: Contextual Evaluation

- I (36-45) The response **focuses very sharply on the key issue** in the question, using good and very relevant references to the Passages and contextual material. Contextual knowledge is used **very appropriately and effectively** in relation to the question. (This contextual knowledge does **not** require lengthy descriptions but brief and pertinent references to support the argument.). The answer **contains a very good balance** between Passage and contextual evaluation in **reaching a judgement** about the issue. There is **clear and substantial evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved by comments on the validity of the arguments in the Passages using the other Passages or own knowledge (**not** all the Passages need to be evaluated). The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

[‘A very good balance’ means that evidence for the final judgement is drawn both from the Passages and from contextual knowledge but not that the whole response must be equally balanced between use of the Passages and contextual knowledge. Own knowledge need not be extensive or exhaustive as long as it provides supported evaluation of the views in the Passages. The Passages need not necessarily all be evaluated, although the main views expressed in them should be. The degree to which this is done successfully may help to decide where in the Band the answer should be placed.]

- II (31-35)** The response **focuses on the key issue** in the question, using very relevant references to the Passages and contextual material. The quality of the contextual comments and some aspects of the internal analysis of the Passages, whilst sound, will be **less rigorous** than in Band I. There is a **fairly clear and fairly full evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved and a **judgement is reached**. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

[Answers in this Band are likely to be less well developed in some way. The Passages may be less well used, one view may be barely evaluated, the judgement may be based mainly on the Passages or contextual knowledge may not be equally well linked to the Passages. The Passages should be the main focus of the answer and there should be some supported evaluation, but it does not need to be lengthy.]

- III (27-30)** The response **considers the interpretations** in the Passages and deploys some contextual knowledge. The argument is clear, but comments will be **thinner** and overall **judgements less effective** than in Band II. The organisation of the answer is **uneven**. There is a **reasonable degree of evaluation** of different interpretations involved. The writing is generally fluent and historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.

[Answers may consider the views in the Passages in general terms without much detailed reference. The judgement may be incomplete or not made at all or all the factors/arguments may be seen as equally valid/important. There may be quite limited use of contextual knowledge, or it may not be wholly relevant to the key issue, leading to incomplete, unsupported evaluation. The argument should be mostly clear.]

- IV (22-26)** The response shows **considerable imbalance between** Passage evaluation and contextual knowledge. A **basic argument** is provided. The Passages may be largely used to **illustrate the argument** put forward and not as the focus of the answer. There is **some attempt at evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.

[Imbalance means a response where the contextual knowledge is the main focus and the Passages are glanced at in passing, often to confirm the arguments put forward from own knowledge. Alternatively there may be some interpretation of the Passages which is linked to the key issue but no real evaluation. Some confusion may creep into the argument.]

- V (18-21)** The response shows **some evidence of knowledge** of the key issue, but may make **little use** of the Passages. The answer **lacks coherent structure** but the direction of the attempted argument is **mostly relevant**. There is **little evaluation** of different interpretations involved. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer contains frequent errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

[Answers may describe the Passages, perhaps with little reference to the key issue or to the interpretations in the Passages. The argument may not carry much conviction or be made clearly. Contextual knowledge may not be well related to the key issue or indeed to the Passages. Evaluation will probably be slight.]

- VI (10-17)** The response shows **serious weaknesses in knowledge** and ability to handle contextual questions. The argument may be **fragmentary**. There may be **serious irrelevance**. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows very significant weakness in the grammar, punctuation and spelling.

[These answers are not likely to be focused on the key issue and the argument may be impossible to follow. There may be misunderstanding of the Passages.]

- VII (0-9)** The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt** to convey relevant knowledge and understanding. There is no attempt to answer the question. There is no argument and no supporting evidence for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the grammar, punctuation and spelling.

ESSAY

NB

- **Answers which make absolutely no use of/reference to historical debate may NOT be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.**
- **The quality of English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.**
- **Some topics by their very nature are less strongly focused around historical debate. Question-specific mark schemes will provide the necessary guidance on this.**
- **Answers require some understanding of broad schools of historical debate, but NEVER depend on any reference to the views of particular historians; pertinent references to such will, however, be given credit, as in any AS/A2 Unit.**
- **Demonstration of an understanding of broad schools of historical debate need NOT involve anything very sophisticated: hints and fragments of it in an answer will meet in full the criterion for AO2 and satisfy the demands of the high Bands.**

BANDS I-VII/45

- I (36–45)** *The response is not perfect but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve at A2 Level in examination conditions.* The response is **focused clearly** on the demands of the question, even if there is **some unevenness**. The approach is clearly **analytical rather than descriptive** or narrative and, in particular, there is a **clear and evident** (but not necessarily totally full) **evaluation** of the historical debate bearing upon the topic which is **carefully integrated** into the overall approach. The answer is fully relevant. Most of the argument is structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material - the degree of that support will help to distinguish between answers higher and lower in the Band. The impression is that a **good solid answer** has been provided. The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- II (31–35)** The response is **focused clearly** on the question but there is **some unevenness in content**. The approach is **mostly analytical and relevant**. The answer is generally structured coherently and supported by appropriate factual material. However, the answer will **not be equally thorough throughout**, for example evaluating the relevant debate less well. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

III (27–30)

The response reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt** to provide an appropriate argument and factual knowledge. The approach contains **analysis or explanation but it may be inadequately supported**. There is a reasonable grasp of the elements of the debate which bears upon the topic, and this is to a degree integrated into the overall approach. The answer is mostly relevant. The answer may **lack balance and depth** in factual knowledge. Most of the answer is structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence. The writing is generally fluent and the historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.

IV (22–26) The response indicates an **attempt to argue relevantly**. The approach may depend more on **some heavily descriptive or narrative sections** than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. There **is some knowledge of the historical debate** which bears upon the topic, but this may be **'bolted-on'** to the other material. Alternatively, the answer may consist largely of **description of schools of thought** that is not well directed at the specific question and is not well supported factually. Factual material may be used to **impart information** or describe events **rather than to address directly** the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.

V (18–21) The response offers **some elements of an appropriate answer** but there is little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of a question. The approach **lacks analysis and explanation** and the quality of the description or narrative, although mostly accurate and relevant, **is not linked effectively to the answer**. There may be **some hints of the historical debate** which bear upon the topic, but it will probably be poorly understood. Alternatively, there may be **extensive description of schools of thought** that is only slightly directed at the specific question. The structure of the argument shows weaknesses in organisation and the treatment of topics within the answer is unbalanced. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains frequent errors.

VI (10–17) The response is not **properly focused on the requirements** of the question. There may be many **unsupported assertions**. The argument may be of very **limited relevance** and there may be **confusion about the implications** of the question. There will be **no sense of the historical debate** on the topic. The answer may be largely **fragmentary and incoherent**, perhaps only in brief note form. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows very significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

VII (0–9) The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt** to convey relevant knowledge and understanding of the general topic and of the historical debate on it. There is **no attempt to answer** the question. There is **no argument and no supporting evidence** for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Napoleon I

- 1 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Napoleon's regime was based on popular consent. [45]

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passage **A** argues most strongly that the regime was based on consent, especially from below. The other Passages suggest that there was passive consent from the notables in all the Passages and Passage **C** refers to all adult males being given the vote. But **B**, **C** and **D** do tend to see the regime as more narrowly based than does Passage **A**. Passage **B** stresses the way in which Napoleon encouraged the notables to join his administration and Passage **D** takes up this theme with references to local and national elites. Passage **C** argues that real power was exercised from above. Plebiscites are seen as preserving a semblance of democracy in **C** but as being rigged in **D**. Passage **B** makes it clear that the aristocracy remained aloof from the regime.

Candidates can use evidence developing the idea that Napoleon relied heavily on the notables as well as evidence showing how he feared popular risings and took care to ensure obedience, while getting regular reports about public opinion.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have **a ceiling of Band II**.

Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have **a ceiling of Band III**.

- 2 Assess the claim that Napoleon was a military genius. [45]

Debate: Can Napoleon really be considered a military genius or was he just lucky?

What matters here is not the conclusion the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

The view that Napoleon was a military genius can be illustrated by reference to his innovations, his tactical ability, his leadership qualities and his reorganization of the French army. Examples to show these attributes in particular battles and campaigns would be useful.

The alternative view is that he was fortunate in the poor quality of his opponents, that he often was an opportunist, 'scrambling to victory', that he had some very able subordinates who won battles for him and that he was often simply very fortunate.

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

- 3 To what extent have the negative effects of Napoleon's rule outside France been exaggerated? [45]**

Debate: Are the criticisms of Napoleon's rule of Europe justified?

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

On the negative side, candidates could refer to the view that the Empire and client state system was little more than a spoils system set up to serve the interests of France in general and Napoleon in particular. The continental system had a largely deleterious impact and Napoleon was constantly demanding men and money from Europe. Alternatively there is evidence to modify this view from the general introduction of the Code Napoleon, the removal of oppressive regimes, the use of some local customs, the end of serfdom and the rationalization of administration. Candidates might conclude that the effects were different in different areas, where the amount of power exercised by France might vary or that Napoleon's rule was often an improvement on what went before.

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

Gladstone and Disraeli 1846-1880

- 4 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Disraeli had a better understanding of British interests over the Bulgarian issue than Gladstone. [45]**

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Candidates might begin by defining British interests or by pointing out that both believed they were following British interests. Passage **B** is the one which argues most strongly that Disraeli was following a long-established British policy of keeping Turkey going in order to keep Russia out of the Mediterranean, from where she could threaten British routes to India. Passage **C** indicates that Gladstone was representing the popular moral viewpoint and Passage **A** supports this with references to *vile crimes*. Passage **D** suggests another interpretation that Gladstone saw conspiracy at work and to root it out was in British interests. The role of Turkey in Bulgaria was seen as justified by Disraeli for tactical reasons but attacked by Gladstone in Passages **A** and **C** as oppressive. Disraeli in Passage **B** is seen as underrating the horror. Passage **D** shows there was a good deal of confusion and personal animosity in both their comments and Passage **C** backs this up. Candidates might debate how far a moral viewpoint was in British interests.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have **a ceiling of Band II**.

Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have **a ceiling of Band III**.

- 5 How important was Gladstone's contribution to the development of Liberalism from 1852 to 1868? [45]**

Debate: was Gladstone the prime mover in Liberalism or was it other factors.

What matters here is not the conclusion the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

One view is that Gladstone's role was vital, notably his free trade budgets, his appeal to the working classes as the 'People's William', his abolition of the paper duty against opposition from the House of Lords and his general high moral tone. All these can be seen as major influences in the development of Liberalism.

Alternatively the Liberals can be seen as a disunited group made up of Whigs, Radicals and single issue 'faddists'. Gladstone then appears to be less of a hero, refusing to join Palmerston's government and nearly going in with Derby in 1858. He was not at the meeting in Willis' Rooms in 1859 and was opposed to the modest Conservative proposals for franchise reform at that time, although this was a Liberal aim. The Radicals were pressing hard for religious reform, which Gladstone did not always support and for administrative reform which he did favour, while the Whigs also had a role.

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

6 How effective were the domestic reforms of Disraeli's ministry from 1868 to 1874?

Debate: Did the reforms make a real difference or was their impact limited?

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

One view is that the reforms made a great deal of difference and the Artisans Dwelling Act, Public Health and Trade Union reforms could all be instanced. Disraeli himself claimed the Trade Union question had been settled permanently and some union leaders agreed he had done much for the workers. There was progress in improving health in towns, following one of Disraeli's pet themes.

Alternatively candidates could point out that much of the legislation was permissive and did not enforce regulations about issues such as adulteration of food, pollution of rivers or even the Plimsoll Line on merchant shipping.

Candidates might conclude that the reforms did have considerable long term effects when seen in the context of developments over the next 30 years but that short term there was less for Disraeli to boast about.

A catalogue of the legislation with comments about effectiveness is unlikely to achieve the highest Bands.

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

Bismarck and the Unification of Germany 1858-1871

- 7 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the political importance of the *Zollverein* has been exaggerated. [45]**

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passage **B** is the clearest exponent of the view that the *Zollverein* was the vital factor referring to an *irreversible momentum*. This indicates its role has not been exaggerated. Passages **A** and **C** also see the *Zollverein* as important, *decisive* in **A** and *one strong bond uniting the nation* in **C**. Even if neither suggests that the economic union was the most important factor, both show how Prussian leadership was strengthened by the *Zollverein* and so hint that its importance may have been overrated. Passage **D** challenges this view and says the *Zollverein* was *marginal*. The first and third points made in **D** are questioned by **C** which argues economic power was linked to political power and **A** which gives examples of ways in which the *Zollverein* did provide economic benefits, thus challenging the statement in the question. The second point in **D** could be evaluated from contextual knowledge. Candidates could argue that the *Zollverein* did contribute to the economic power of Prussia which, in turn, allowed Prussia to build up her army which then won rapid victories to bring about unification and so its role was vital. Passage **B** supports this point in its last sentences.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have **a ceiling of Band II**.

Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have **a ceiling of Band III**.

- 8 How far do you agree that Bismarck had achieved all his main goals by 1867? [45]**

Debate: Whether Bismarck was satisfied by 1867 or not.

What matters here is not the conclusion the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

One view is that Bismarck had achieved all he set out to do when he became Prussian leader in 1862. Prussia now dominated Germany. He led a new Germany which excluded Austria. Threats from liberals and nationalists had been contained.

The alternative view is that Bismarck had more to do and that he wanted to include the four south German states in the Confederation as soon as he could, rather than be content with their semi-detached relationship with the Confederation.

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

- 9 **Assess the view that the new German state formed in 1871 was based more on Prussian power than on liberal values.** [45]

Debate: Which was it – one or the other?

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

One view is that Prussian power dominated the new state. The federal nature favoured the biggest state – Prussia. The complexity of the constitution also favoured Prussia and the process culminating at Versailles favoured Prussia. The wars which led to unification were Prussian wars.

On the other hand, there were liberal values in the constitution in the democratically elected Reichstag.

Candidates are likely to argue that Prussian power is hard to deny but there is more debate about how liberal the constitution was.

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

Roosevelt's America 1920-1941

- 10 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the New Deal was successful. [45]**

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passage **A** refers to the success of the New Deal in bringing some form of relief from economic depression and Passage **B** argues that it was a turning point and led to an increase in presidential power. Passage **C** mentions achievements in financial controls, the creation of a welfare state and the role of the federal government in regulating the economy. But Passage **A** qualifies its judgement by stating only limited finance was available to make the New Deal a success and Passage **D** argues more strongly that there was very little real success, given the continuing unemployment and fall in national personal income. Passage **B** suggests there was not a full recovery. Passage **C** states there was no real danger of a revolution so the achievements of the New Deal could be seen as less substantial than they might appear at first. Candidates might use evidence from the plethora of agencies or from the reforms of the Second New Deal to support their arguments.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have **a ceiling of Band II**.

Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have **a ceiling of Band III**.

- 11 Assess the view that the United States was an isolationist power in foreign affairs from 1920 to 1939. [45]**

Debate: how far was the US isolationist in foreign policy

What matters here is not the conclusion the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

One view is that Harding restored 'normalcy' to US foreign policy from 1921, taking a detached view of European and international affairs. The decision not to join the United Nations illustrates this view. Equally the US remained aloof from European and Asian affairs up to 1939. Europe was left to Britain and France. The US did not get involved when Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, partly for economic reasons. Nor was the US ready to react to the invasion of Abyssinia by Mussolini or to the rise of Hitler in any overt way.

The alternative view is that the US was involved in Europe through the Dawes and Young Plans, it contributed to the work of some League of Nations agencies and the Washington Naval Treaties of 1922 was an important milestone in foreign affairs. In the 1920s the US was active in Central and Southern America in countries such as Nicaragua. After 1933, Roosevelt, although limited in what he could do by Congress and by the Neutrality Acts, became increasingly interventionist and after 1939 with lend lease was committed to supporting Britain.

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

- 12 How far do you agree with the view that National Prohibition failed because of organized crime? [45]

Debate: What were the factors that caused Prohibition to fail and which was the most vital.

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

The view that the link with organized crime was the key factor should be fully explored. Candidates could mention the role of gangsters such as Al Capone and the Chicago mob whose activities exploited prohibition and brought it into disrepute. Lengthy descriptions of bootlegging and speakeasies are not needed but examples can help to illustrate the argument. Those campaigning to end prohibition argued that crime had increased and that ordinary, usually law-abiding, citizens had been enticed into criminal activity.

On the other hand it can be argued that other factors contributed as well or even more. The practical enforcement difficulties such as the long coastline, the borders with Canada and Mexico and the failure to control supplies of industrial alcohol which were used to make home-made spirits all had an impact. There was a lack of will to obey the law as *Americans liked to drink* and even Harding at the White House defied the law.

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

Lenin and the establishment of Bolshevik Power 1903-1924

- 13 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the New Economic Policy was introduced to win over the peasants. [45]**

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passages **B**, **C** and **D** all in part support this view. **B** shows how the peasants began to produce more food, **C** refers to the increased incentive for the peasants and **D** explicitly in the words of Lenin himself shows that the peasants had to be satisfied.

The Passages go on to develop the view by explaining how vital it was to win over the peasants. In **B** the famine led to help being accepted from capitalist countries, in **C** the peasants were so determined that even savage repression failed to deter them and **D** supports the view that terror and force did not work.

Passage **A** sees NEP as a betrayal of Bolshevik principles and that it was aimed at appeasing the bourgeoisie, rather than the peasants, but even this Passage acknowledges that NEP did increase prosperity.

Other factors include harsh weather conditions in **B**, grain requisitioning being unpopular in **B**, **C** and **D**, the need for a fairer taxation system in **C**, the need for food in **D** and the need to provide commodities small farmers could buy.

Candidates are likely to conclude that winning over the peasants was important as Lenin was prepared to abandon a policy which was ideologically sound and that this, as Passage **A** demonstrates, was not popular with some Bolsheviks despite its endorsement by the Party Congress as shown in **C** and **D**.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have **a ceiling of Band II**.

Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have **a ceiling of Band III**.

- 14 Assess the importance of the 1905 Revolution and its consequences in contributing to the final split between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in 1912. [45]**

Debate: How far was the split caused by the events and results of 1905 and how far by other factors?

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

One view is that the 1905 Revolution was a key factor. The Mensheviks led by Martov, betrayed the working class revolution by their readiness to come to terms with the Tsarist government, whereas the Bolsheviks saw the need for a better organized revolutionary group. The Mensheviks went on to co-operate with the Constitutional Democrats in the Duma after the revolution whereas the Bolsheviks had no role in the revolution, and were not even involved in the St Petersburg soviet and were hostile to the Duma. These divisions simply hardened over time.

On the other hand, it can be argued that Lenin had always favoured a distinctive and active strategy as outlined in *What is to be Done?* as early as 1902. Efforts to reunite the Social Democrats after 1905 failed because of Lenin's intransigence and determination not to be allied to the bourgeoisie. He hoped to bring down the Tsar as rapidly as possible and then proceed to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. A professional and dedicated group of revolutionaries could be seen as the best way forward given the activities of the Okhrana rather than the more gradual policy of the Mensheviks which was to collaborate with any party opposed to the Tsar.

Candidates could conclude that the split was engineered by Lenin for his own ends and that he never intended to co-operate with other opposition groups.

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

15 Assess the view that Trotsky was more responsible than Lenin for the success of the Revolution of October 1917. [45]

Debate: The relative importance of the roles of Trotsky and Lenin

What matters here is not the conclusion the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

One view is that Trotsky had a key role in the Central Committee who rejected Lenin's idea of an armed rising in favour of a grass roots movement to coincide with the Soviet Congress meeting and to avoid bloodshed as far as possible. Other supporters of Trotsky were not keen Leninists.

The alternative view is that Lenin had a vital contribution in April 1917 on his return to Russia in his transformation of the Bolshevik party. He took advantage of the discontent within Russia to win over the workers to his views, helped by some very effective slogans. The actual mechanics of revolution can be seen as owing less to Lenin.

Candidates may stress that the Soviet view inevitably emphasises the role of Lenin

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

Chamberlain and Anglo-German relations 1918-1939

- 16 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that British policy towards Germany in the period 1919-1935 was misguided. [45]**

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passage **A** refers to British policy as misguided in that it did not reflect the fact that Britain had won the war and allowed the defeated Germany to emerge looking like the victor. Passage **D** reinforces the idea that Britain had lost the Peace as it was widely seen as being immoral and so was eager to appease Germany but is less clear that this was misguided. Passage **B** suggests British policy was on the right lines in that Lloyd George recognised what was needed and did not appease unthinkingly. He saw the needs of the French as having some legitimacy. Passage **C** agrees that British policy stopped short of total, and thus misguided, appeasement and that military spending was cut back, a sensible policy in times of some economic turmoil. Passage **D**, although agreeing with **A** about Versailles, makes the additional point that Britain had adopted its usual policy of withdrawal from continental involvement and this was sound, again in view of the economic conditions. The general points made, particularly in **A** and **B** could be evaluated by means of examples. Candidates may see the policies described in the Passages in the context of the period and argue that the constraints on governments made the policies far from being misguided.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have **a ceiling of Band II**.

Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have **a ceiling of Band III**.

- 17 Assess the view that Chamberlain's main aim in following a policy of appeasement from 1937 to 1939 was to buy enough time for Great Britain to rearm. [45]**

Debate: the reasons behind appeasement and which was the most vital

What matters here is not the conclusion the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

One view is that appeasement was a shrewd policy in response to the political and economic constraints on British foreign policy. The public preference was for limited government funds to be spent on social reform rather than on defence expenditure. There was no way Britain's forces would be a match for expansionist Nazi Germany until there had been considerable rearmament. This view implies that Chamberlain recognised what Hitler was about and expected there to be a war for which he planned to be prepared.

The alternative view is that Chamberlain appeased Hitler because he believed this was the only way to avoid a war in Europe, for which Britain was ill-prepared. He thought Hitler's reasonable demands could be met in this way and trusted Hitler. In this view Chamberlain was determined not to risk a war and any repeat of WWI.

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

- 18 How far do you agree with the view that the British government finally abandoned the policy of appeasement in September 1939, rather than in March 1939? [45]**

Debate: When exactly was appeasement abandoned.

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

The view that appeasement was only abandoned when Britain declared war on Germany can be supported by the fact that Chamberlain was hopeful even at that late stage of avoiding war by negotiation and had to be pushed into the declaration by the House of Commons. He had been very reluctant to engage in negotiations with Russia as a preliminary to standing up to Germany.

On the other hand it can be argued that March 1939 was a turning point with the take over of the rest of Czechoslovakia and the guarantee to Poland. Rearmament was stepped up and there was a change in public opinion in favour of a war or at least to the view that a war was very likely.

Candidates might argue that much of the government had more or less abandoned appeasement in March and it was only Chamberlain and his circle who clung on hoping for the best.

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

Stalin and the Development of the Cold War in Europe 1941-1955

- 19 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Stalin's actions in Eastern Europe during 1944 and 1945 were the main reason for disputes between the wartime allies at that time. [45]**

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passage **D** has the most damning indictment of Stalin's actions and claims that he allowed the Nazis to massacre the free Poles, despite the pleadings of Churchill to save them and hence a puppet government was established. Passage **B** indicates that the agreement made by the allies at Teheran was equally responsible for a puppet government in Poland and so Stalin's actions were less to blame. Passages **A** and **C** show that the western allies were far from guiltless in causing tension between the allies in relation to the post-war settlement and were as keen as Stalin to protect their own interests. In **A** Churchill and Stalin negotiated and in **C** Roosevelt and Stalin, showing the allies were not united in a stand against Stalin. **C** is particularly clear on the mistrust between the allies. Candidates might mention that the delay in opening the second front was a cause of disputes linked with the Russian belief that the Red Army had borne the brunt of the fighting, hinted at in Passage **D**.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**.

Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

- 20 Assess the view that the USA developed the policy of 'containment' of communism in the period 1945 to 1948 only because of the aggressive actions of the USSR. [45]**

Debate: Whether the US introduced policies to counter Russian aggression or whether there were other motives.

What matters here is not the conclusion the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

One view is that the US only acted because of Russian aggression such as in the takeover of eastern Europe, the coming of the Iron Curtain, the establishment of Cominform in 1947, the coup in Czechoslovakia in 1948 and the Berlin Blockade begun in 1948. The hard line advice given to Truman and Kennan's 'Long Telegram' could be seen as illustrating US reaction to these events. Truman was determined to take a strong line, given his lack of experience in foreign affairs.

The alternative view is that the US was trying to help an impoverished and defenceless Europe and to build up the economy of Europe for trading purposes. The giving of Marshall Aid could illustrate this range of motives.

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

- 21 Assess the view that Stalin's takeover of Eastern Europe from 1945 to 1948 was provoked by the need to defend the USSR from future attack. [45]**

Debate: Reasons for Stalin's expansion into Eastern Europe – defensive or offensive?

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

One view is that the USSR was concerned by security, given the invasions of Russia by Germany in both world wars; Stalin needed to build up a buffer zone to keep out attackers. Stalin was suspicious about the aims of the western allies. Russia had endured heavy losses seemingly unappreciated by the west and been occupied by the Nazi armies.

On the other hand, there were other factors at work. Truman was more anti-Communist than Roosevelt had been. The gaining of atomic weapons by the west was a provocation. Potsdam was much less harmonious than previous conferences. The freeing of Eastern Europe from Nazi rule had largely been achieved by the Red Army and sometimes with the support of local people.

Candidates might use examples of the takeover of Bulgaria in 1945-6, Poland and Hungary in 1947 and Czechoslovakia in 1948 to shed light on Stalin's motivation.

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