

GCE

History A

Unit **F962/02**: European and World History Period Studies
Option B: Modern 1795–2003

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2015

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

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

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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

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

© OCR 2015

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

| Annotation | Meaning |
|-------------|--|
| BP | Blank Page – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response. |
| A | Assert |
| AN | Analysis |
| DET | Description |
| DEV | Develop |
| EXP | Explains |
| F | Factor |
| IRRL | Irrelevance |
| J | Judgment |
| LNK | linked |
| NAQ | Not the question |
| SC | Simple comment |
| X | Error/wrong |
| V | View |

2. **Subject-specific Marking Instructions**

**Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs and corresponds to the UMS
2 answers: each maximum mark 50.**

| | A01a | A01b |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| IA | 21-24 | 24-26 |
| IB | 18-20 | 22-23 |
| II | 16-17 | 19-21 |
| III | 14-15 | 16-18 |
| IV | 12-13 | 13-15 |
| V | 9-11 | 11-12 |
| VI | 4-8 | 6-10 |
| VII | 0-3 | 0-5 |

Notes:

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

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

| AOs | AO1a | AO1b |
|------------------|---|---|
| Level II | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic • Generally accurate use of historical terminology • Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear <p style="text-align: center;">16-17</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description • The analysis of factors and/ or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages. <p style="text-align: center;">19-21</p> |
| Level III | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic but there may be some inaccuracy • Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used • Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated <p style="text-align: center;">14-15</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some/uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context • Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events OR answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin. • Answer considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance or linkages between factors/issues • Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions <p style="text-align: center;">16-18</p> |

| AOs | AO1a | AO1b |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Level IV | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant. • Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication. <p style="text-align: center;">12-13</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory. • Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context. • Answer may be largely descriptive/ narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained OR answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis. • Limited points made about importance/links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions <p style="text-align: center;">13-15</p> |
| Level V | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some relevant accurate historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material also • Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/ inappropriate use • Often unclear and disorganised sections; writing will often be clear if basic but there may be some illegibility and weak prose where the sense is not clear or obvious <p style="text-align: center;">9-11</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic • General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Attempts at analysis will be weak or generalised, based on plausible but unsubstantiated points or points with very general or inappropriate substantiation OR there may be a relevant but patchy description of events/developments coupled with judgements that are no more than assertions • There will be some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic not address the focus of the question <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p> |

| AOs | AO1a | AO1b |
|------------------|--|---|
| Level VI | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy • Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation <p style="text-align: center;">4-8</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little understanding of key concepts • Very limited understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements • Limited explanation will be very brief/ fragmentary • The answer will be characterised by generalised assertion and/or description/ narratives, often brief <p style="text-align: center;">6-10</p> |
| Level VII | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and accurate knowledge • Very fragmentary and disorganised response; very poor use of English and some incoherence <p style="text-align: center;">0-3</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of key concepts or historical developments. • No valid explanations • Typically very brief and very descriptive answer <p style="text-align: center;">0-5</p> |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 1 | <p>'The most important reason for Napoleon's rise to power by 1804 was his ability.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue other factors were more significant. In relation to the given factor, candidates may argue that if it were not for his success as a general then little would have been heard of Napoleon – i.e. that his success as a general was a necessary but not sufficient cause of his rise to power. In support of his generalship candidate should draw on his rise as an officer and general during the 1790s, from the siege of Toulon in 1793, through his Italian campaigns in 1796-7 and his efforts in Egypt in 1798. They may comment on Napoleon's rise in the military and the reputation he gained from Toulon to Egypt. Candidates may also consider the nature of the constitution of the Directory which made it weak and increasingly dependent on the military; the internal politics of the Five Directors and their rivalries; unrest at home and the growing desire for change; and the impact of defeat against the Second Coalition. Candidates may well argue that the weakness of the Directory provided Napoleon with the opportunity to seize power, but that, on its own, it does not explain his rise. Candidates may refer to other factors, such as: the significant role played by politicians like Barras; aspects of the Coup of Brumaire such as the role of Napoleon's brother and the miscalculation of Sieyes and others who had hoped for a tame general (and here the reluctance of generals like Moreau to play the role is significant); and, of course, Napoleon's own ambitions. Candidates may consider the reasons why he made himself Emperor in order to cover the period from 1799 to 1804. Competent knowledge will require some reference to events beyond 1799.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 2 | <p>To what extent was the strength of the French army the most important reason for Napoleon's military success in the period 1796 to 1809?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue other factors were more significant. In relation to the strengths of the French army candidates may point to the size, membership and organisation of the French army, the battlefield tactics and campaign strategies reflecting the legacy of pre-Napoleonic reforms. Such discussion needs to be balanced against other factors such as weaknesses of his opponents (candidates may discuss some of the following: the size, membership and organisation of their armies and their strategies/tactics, the (in)competence of their generals, the divisions between political and military leadership, the weaknesses of coalitions and alliances and so forth) ; Napoleon's reforms of the army (corps system), the competence of the officer corps, Napoleon's generalship, Napoleon's combination of political and military leadership, the resources of France, and so on. Candidates may well support their arguments by reference to Napoleon's Italian campaigns, the Marengo campaign, Ulm and Austerlitz, Jena and Auerstadt, Eylau and Friedland, Wagram. Candidates may discuss Napoleon's capacities as a military strategist, campaigner, battlefield general as well as his ability to motivate men, organize his armies and appoint able commanders. In doing so they may refer to specific campaigns (in Italy, Egypt, Marengo, Ulm, Austerlitz, Friedland, Wagram), the development of the corps system and the significance of generals such as Davout and Lannes. In assessing the role of Napoleon's generalship they should set his qualities of generalship against other factors, such as: his position as both ruler of France and Commander-in-chief after he became First Consul; the developments in the French army during the French Revolution as a mass army with revised organization and battle formations (such as the mixed order, re-modelled artillery); the comparative weaknesses of his opponents both in terms of their armies and generals and the failings of the second and third coalitions.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 3 | <p>'Napoleon's rule brought little benefit to the areas he conquered.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. This question is about the impact of Napoleon on that part of Europe outside France that France directly or indirectly controlled. Candidates may draw distinctions between different areas and periods of influence to highlight different impacts. On the negative side candidates may well point to the subordination of these areas to the needs of France and Napoleon, taxation, conscription, the antipathy of those who lost out from government/administrative changes, the impact of the Continental blockade and system (such as the damage to the Italian silk industry to protect that of France), the use of the Empire and satellites states as a 'spoils' system to reward Napoleon's marshals (as in the Grand Duchy of Warsaw). However, candidates should balance this discussion by discussing some of the possible positives. For example, they may point to the benefits of the changes brought about in the former Holy Roman Empire/Low Countries/Italian peninsula encompassing, for example, the Code Napoleon, the opportunities for the professional middle classes and the reorganisation of states and rationalised and more efficient government.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 4 | <p>To what extent did Louis XVIII solve the problems he faced?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. Stronger answers are likely to identify the problems that Louis faced and then evaluate his success in dealing with them. Candidates may identify problems such as the Napoleonic legacy and the 100 Days, the power and influence of the royalists, support for the regime, terms of the Peace Treaty at the end of the war and the growing power and influence of the Ultras. There may be discussion of the nature of The Charter, the impact of the Hundred Days, the 'White Terror' and Chambre Introuvable, legislation in relation to rights to vote, army reform and press freedom, the payment of the indemnity and the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), Ultras, and so on. Candidates may suggest that Louis XVIII did enough in the years after his second restoration to prevent further revolution and had the advantage of 'exhaustion' after 25 years of revolution and warfare. As long as Louis seemed to work within the spirit of the Charter and there was no major economic crisis his rule would remain largely acceptable. On the other hand, candidates may suggest that the promise of the early years where he appeared to work within the spirit of the Charter were undermined by the increasing influence of the ultras after the murder of the Duc de Berry in 1820. They may also suggest that Louis could not undo the revolutionary tradition, nor could he eliminate liberalism. Opposition was bound to grow as the regime became more reactionary.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 5 | <p>Assess the reasons for the growth of opposition to the rule of Louis Philippe.</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. The question requires candidates to weigh up the relative importance of factors that caused opposition, answers that simply provide a list of reasons will be limited to Level III for AO1b. There are many reasons that candidates might consider. Some may consider Louis Philippe's character, candidates may mention his caution, good nature, lack of desire for bloodshed, progressive and liberal instincts following his Orleanist heritage, bourgeois qualities and so on. In relation to Louis Philippe, candidates may argue that the 'bourgeois' monarch did little to endear himself to his people, that he was innately conservative, indifferent and inactive ('immobilism', 'enriches-vous' and 'laisser-faire'), failed to deliver 'la gloire' in foreign policy, and failed to bring in liberal or social reforms. Candidates may refer to the pressure for constitutional and social reform and the intransigent attitude of Guizot's government and the specific issue of the Reform banquets as a cause of opposition. Such discussion needs to be placed in the context of other factors such as: the wider context of opposition (socialists, republicans, liberals and bonapartists). There may be consideration of the longer term problem of poverty and social unrest; the impact of poor harvests in 1845-6; the international financial crisis from 1846; rising unemployment and cutbacks in production; the apparent indifference of the government. Candidates may examine some of the following areas in developing their argument: the repression of social unrest; the lack of significant social reform; policies toward government, the constitution and political change; political corruption; economic policy; the Railway Law; 'immobilism'; 'enrichissez-vous'; Guizot. Candidates may argue that politically Louis-Philippe did manage to stay in power for 18 years, but was eventually overthrown and that his approach did not neutralise the pressure for political reform. These include: the longer term problem of poverty and social unrest; the impact of poor harvests in 1845 – 6; the international financial crisis from 1846; over-investment in railways; rising unemployment and cutbacks in production; the growth of political opposition (liberals, Bonapartists, socialists); and the desire for reform (Reform Banquets).</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 6 | <p>'Napoleon III's domestic policies brought little benefit to France.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. Candidates may set their consideration in the context of Napoleon III's desire to do something to help the poor by means of economic stimulus. Clearly there were some benefits for France. For example, candidates may point in particular to state stimulus to railway building (with a tenfold increase in kilometres of railway during his period of rule) through the operation of leases and the considerable knock-on effects to other industries (6% p.a. growth in iron, steel and coal) and agriculture (extension of railway network stimulated production for urban markets). They may also point to promotion of banking (Credit Mobilier) and free trade (Chevalier/Cobden Treaty with Britain). They are also likely to discuss Haussman's work in rebuilding central Paris: 136 km of new boulevards and squares with elegant new buildings along them, and a new sewer system. The benefits in terms of prestige and appearance were certainly impressive. However candidates should balance the benefits against the cost which was high with 20,000 homes destroyed and no attempt to provide housing for the poor. Similarly the cost of the stimulus to railway building was a speculation boom, and the foundations of the new banking system were unsound (Credit Mobilier had to be rescued in 1867). There was also much criticism of Napoleon III's free trade policy that removed protective tariffs from French businesses. They may point to the social costs of the last and the divisions over free trade. There are further qualifications to this success, such as the end of the railway boom in the 1860s and economic difficulties increased in the late 1860s. Candidates may also discuss whether Napoleon's rule brought political benefits to the people of France and may consider how liberal the regime was and whether the French people gained any political freedoms.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 7 | <p>Assess the reasons that contributed to the opening up of the West in this period.</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. In order to access the higher levels candidates must evaluate the relative importance of a range of factors and not simply provide a list of reasons, answers that are simply a list of reasons will be limited to Level III for AO1b. In assessing the importance of the policies of Federal governments, candidates may discuss some of the following areas: Federal sponsorship of exploration and surveying; Federal acquisition of territory; the organization of acquired lands into territories and states; the role of the Federal army in policing the frontier, the trails west and dealing with Native Americans; Federal sponsorship of communications (especially the trans-continental railway); Federal encouragement to settlement through legislation such as the Homestead Act. To balance such discussion candidates may argue that Federal policy often followed rather than preceded settlement and the real stimulus came from the needs of fur traders, cattlemen, farmers and miners as well as those seeking refuge, like the Mormons, from persecution, and the development of communications. In relation to the mining frontier, candidates are likely to focus on how various mineral discoveries led to ‘rushes’ of settlement often at the expense of Native Americans. They are likely to discuss the California Gold Rush but many will draw exemplar material more widely to show how different discoveries effectively opened up many different areas to white settlement (from the Georgian Hills in the late 1820s to the Black Hills of Dakota in the 1870s). Candidates may argue that the needs of these mining settlements contributed to the improvements in communication and the involvement of the Federal government that helped open up the West more generally. In relation to railways, candidates may argue that railways were both a symptom and a cause of the opening up of the west. The desire to build transcontinental railways came as a result of the pioneers, settlers, miners and cattlemen who had already gone west. However, there is no doubt that the building of railways acted as a huge stimulus to westward expansion and settlement. Candidates may point to the symbiotic relationship with cattle drives and ranches, and the ease of communication it brought, as well as the huge investment and sales of land. As indicated, candidates may well explore the linkages with other factors: the significance of the cattle drives from the south (Texas) to railheads such as Abilene, Dodge City and Miles City to enable cattle to be transported on to the populous north east in the 1860s. There may also be consideration of the role of groups such as the fur traders in the initial opening up of the region, or of religious groups, such as the Mormons.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|---|
| 8 | <p>'Economic differences were the main cause of tension between the North and South in the period from 1850 to 1861.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue other factors were more significant. Economic issues were closely linked to the issue of slavery and candidates may deal with the two issues together. In considering economic factors candidates may stress the importance of cotton and agriculture to the south, which may be contrasted with the industrial north. Central to their arguments is likely to be the issue of slavery and they may discuss some of the crises of the 1840s and 50s that made the issue of slavery and the issue of the possible westward expansion of slavery so contentious. In this context, candidates may refer to the Mexican War, Wilmot Proviso, Calhoun doctrine, the 'Compromise' of 1850, fugitive slaves, Dred Scott, 'Bleeding Kansas', the development of the Republican Party, Harper's Ferry and so on. Candidates may also discuss the issue of States' rights, the apparent social, cultural and economic divisions between North and South and the suspicions of 'Slave Power conspiracy' and 'northern aggression'. Candidates may argue that the question of westward expansion and the establishment of territories (and then states) in the West became intimately bound up in the growing tensions between northern and southern states. As the USA expanded westward the Missouri Compromise became increasingly untenable and the impact of the Mexican War was to shatter it.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question set. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 9 | <p>Assess the reasons why it took the North so long to win the Civil War.</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. The question requires candidates to consider a range of reasons but at higher levels they will need to evaluate the relative importance of factors. Answers that are simply a list of reasons will be limited to Level III for AO1b. Candidates may focus on the 'advantages' the South enjoyed at the start of the war and the relative failings of the North in the early years of the conflict in order to explain why it took the north so long to be victorious. In relation to the South, candidates may discuss the strategic position – the South were defending their homeland and the North would have to defeat them, the abilities and successes of Confederate generals such as Lee and Jackson, the confidence of the southern soldier (at least at the start of the war) based on his assumption that an agricultural background was better preparation for war than soft city living, the victories of the South in the Virginia theatre between 1861 and 1863 and its continued ability to inflict defeats on the North in 1864 (Wilderness Campaign) and so on. They may set discussion of these in the context of the weaknesses of northern generals like McClellan and Burnside, Lincoln's constant changes in commander-in-chief and his only finding able commanders in Grant and Sherman in 1864. They may compare these aspects to the time it took the North to harness their resource advantages effectively, the strategic need to bring the South to defeat by invasion, destruction and breaking of morale. Candidates may also discuss the relative strategic problems facing North and South, the time it took to organize and mobilise the North's superior resources in men and material, the long term impact of the 'Anaconda' strategy and so forth.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 10 | <p>To what extent were changes in strategy and tactics the most important reason for the defeat of Germany in 1918?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue other factors were more significant. There are a number of factors that candidates might consider. In discussing tactics and strategy they might consider the developments that followed the first Battle of the Somme, such as creeping barrage or the use of tanks. They might suggest that the accuracy of artillery or the use of planes for reconnaissance was also helpful. Stronger answers might link these developments to specific battles and some might also compare strategy and tactics at the start of the war with the later period. In considering other factors some might discuss the importance of the entry of the USA and the morale boost it gave the allies, as well as fresh troops and supplies. Some might discuss developments within Germany and argue it was a collapse of morale on the home front that led to defeat, whilst others might argue that it was the failure of the Ludendorff or Spring Offensive in 1918 that convinced the German command that the war could not be won. In discussing the collapse within Germany there might be some consideration of the impact of the British blockade in creating hunger and the 'turnip winter.' Some might argue that Germany was not defeated as no allied troops were on German soil and that it was actually an armistice and Germany did not expect to be treated as a defeated nation.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 11 | <p>'The greatest impact of the Paris peace settlement was the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue other factors were more significant. Candidates may approach this question in a variety of ways, either by themes, such as political, economic and social impact or they might look at the impact on individual countries; either approach is acceptable. In considering Austro-Hungary they might discuss the break-up of the old Empire and the actual dismemberment of the rump of Hungary, which left them with only 1/3 of their pre-war territory and half its population. Similarly the military terms were severe as they were allowed an army of only 35,000. Candidates might compare this with Austria, which ended any claim Austria could have to be a great power. In particular they might point to the land that was taken to create the new states of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia and the land that was given to Poland. Many candidates are likely to spend much of their answer in considering Germany and examiners should be aware of those that give scant treatment to Austria-Hungary. In considering Germany candidates might mention the loss of land at virtually every point of the compass, as well as the loss of the overseas Empire. These developments might also be linked to the loss of economic resources and the problems this created for paying reparations. Candidates might also consider the resultant political stability or lack of it that was evident in the successor states. Some responses might discuss the impact on the Turkish Empire and the break up and creation of mandates, they might also note that Turkey was so shocked that it resulted in further conflict and Sevres was replaced with Lausanne, suggesting that the greatest impact was on Turkey. There might also be consideration of the impact on Bulgaria, which was quite limited.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 12 | <p>Assess the reasons for the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939.</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. The question requires candidates to consider a range of reasons but at higher levels they will need to evaluate the relative importance of factors. Answers that are simply a list of reasons will be limited to Level III for AO1b. It is likely that many candidates will focus on the responsibility of Germany for the outbreak of war. In relation to this, candidates are likely to point to the evidence of German aggression and bad faith in its foreign policy from its adoption of rearmament, the invasion of the Rhineland, development of alliances, annexation of Austria, Sudeten policy, breaking of the Munich agreement and invasion of Poland. There may also be reference to evidence of Hitler's aggressive ambitions, such as the Hossbach memorandum. To balance this, candidates may consider the role of other factors such as the impact of the depression on international relations, the weakness of the League of Nations, Britain's policy and appeasement, destabilising events elsewhere in Europe, Africa and Asia, the isolationism of the USA. Candidates may conclude that, although Germany must take great responsibility for the onset of war, there were a range of factors involved, not least the impact of British appeasement. Some candidates are likely to focus their attention on British policy towards Germany (Appeasement) and may focus on the late 1930s, discussing the 'encouragement' given to Hitler by the failure of Britain (and other great powers) to act over rearmament, the invasion of the Rhineland, the annexation of Austria, the issue of the Sudetenland and the Munich crisis.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 13 | <p>'Opposition and unrest in Russia from 1894 to 1905 was never a serious threat to Nicholas II.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. Candidates may discuss the longer term context of opposition to the Tsars, but are likely to focus on the development of opposition and unrest after 1894. They may consider the causes of the unrest and point to the economic causes and the economic downturn that provoked strikes and unrest in the period after 1900 alongside the appalling conditions for workers in Russia's growing industries. They may also discuss the problem of land shortage for the peasants. Such discussion may be linked to the developments in political opposition through the Zemstvos and in the development of Russian Social Democracy, the Socialist Revolutionaries and the Union of Liberation Party. They may also point to the humiliation of defeat in the Russo-Japanese War, disillusion with Tsarism, the desire for liberal reforms, the problem of nationalities and the outbreak of the 1905 Revolution. However, candidates should assess the seriousness of the opposition and unrest. Some might argue that it was serious, reflected in some of the concessions made through the use of the Dumas and the reforms they passed. There is likely to be much focus on the 1905 unrest, but examiners should not over-reward responses that focus exclusively on it. In discussing 1905 some may argue it was serious, hence the concessions, whilst others suggest that Nicholas was easily able to reassert his authority and also retained the support of the army. There might be consideration of the repressive policies of Stolypin to suggest the government considered opposition to be serious.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 14 | <p>How stable was Russia in the period from the October Manifesto (1905) to the outbreak of war (1914)?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. At the higher levels candidates must address the issue of 'how stable' and not simply produce a list of examples that suggest Russia was or was not stable. Examiners should note that the question does not require candidates to deal with the events of the 1905 Revolution and candidates who focus on this should not be given great credit. They may however contrast the revolutionary crisis of 1905 with the relative quiet of the period of Stolypin's influence and the development of renewed unrest in the few years before the First World War. Candidates may point to the longer term systemic problems in the Russian economy (particularly in relation to land shortages, the position of serfs and so rural unrest and opposition) as well as the difficulties created in towns and cities through rapid industrialization (poor conditions, long hours, low wages). In addition, candidates may point to particular crises, such as the economic problems before the 1905 Revolution and the issues surrounding the strikes in 1912. On balance, candidates may discuss the longer term context of opposition to the Tsars, and the developments in political opposition through the Zemstvos and in the development of Russian Social Democracy, the Socialist Revolutionaries and the Union of Liberation Party. They may also point to the humiliation of defeat in the Russo-Japanese War, disillusion with Tsarism, the desire for liberal reforms, the problem of nationalities and the outbreak of the 1905 Revolution. Candidates may discuss the political repression that followed the October Manifesto and the Fundamental laws and the nullifying of the potential of the Duma as a check on Tsarism. They may point to these measures as ones that indicate the restoration of Tsarist authority. They may also point to the decline in agitation and the collapse in the membership of the RSDLP. They may also point to Stolypin's 'wager on the strong' as evidence of a different approach and the celebrations of the Romanov dynasty in 1912 of the Tsar's popularity that may suggest the restoration of authority. However, they may also suggest that whilst there was comparative quiet in the period after 1906 stability was more apparent than real and that the pressures that brought about the revolutionary crisis of 1905 were still unresolved, that the events of the Revolution and its immediate aftermath had severely injured the Tsar's authority and that the Tsar had, in any case, had to concede the existence of the Duma, however he limited its effectiveness. They may also point to unrest such as that in the Lena minefields (1912) and suggest that the outbreak of the First World War would expose the fragility of the Tsar's hold on power.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 15 | <p>'The growth of a police state was the most important reason for Stalin's consolidation of power.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. Even if candidates want to disagree with the proposition they must write a good paragraph on the named factor if they want to access Level III or above for AO1b. Candidates may well argue that the concept of a 'police state' lay at the heart of Stalin's hold on power, pointing to the central role played by OGPU / NKVD in 'policing' Soviet society and political life and they may also consider issues such as the purges that characterized Stalin's regime in the 1930s from Kirov to the army purges. The importance of the police state should be balanced against other factors that contributed to Stalin's hold on power, such as the role played by propaganda including the selling of the socialist dream and the development of the cult of personality. Treatment should also cover the control Stalin exercised over the party and central government both in terms of personnel and policy. It may be hard to argue that Stalin enjoyed popular support, but candidates may suggest that some enjoyed the benefits of education and economic change. Candidates may also discuss the ruthlessness with which Stalin dealt with opposition, the significance of the security services and show trials, propaganda and his command of the party machine. There might also be some discussion of how Stalin used his economic policies to control Russia, with the use of internal passports or collectivisation.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 16 | <p>How unstable was Italy in the period from 1896 to 1915?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. At the higher levels candidates will need to address the issue of 'how unstable' and not simply produce a list of examples of stability and instability. Candidates may argue that real hardship was certainly an issue in the late 1890s when famine led to food riots and that this created instability. They may suggest that after 1900 much agitation was still economically based and strikes and protests aimed at better working conditions and although this created some instability it did not threaten the state. They may suggest that whilst Giolitti's economic policies led to economic expansion this only accentuated the divide between the industrial north and the poverty-stricken agricultural south, which added to instability. Candidates are likely to spend some time discussing the growth of socialism and the rise in political and economic unrest in the pre-war years, such as 'red week' which could be used as evidence to suggest instability. They may also point to nationalist agitation that led to the expensive conquest of Libya in 1911-12. However, they may well argue that this visible unrest was a symptom of more serious underlying problems that faced the government, such as those associated with the widening North-South divide, the intense poverty of the south, illiteracy, poor health, the rising emigration (which helped as a safety valve, easing pressures), foreign economic competition, the political divisions between conservatives, liberals, Catholics and socialists, the limitations of the political system, the nationalist pressure for an active and imperial foreign policy. Candidates may argue that many problems were interlinked.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 17 | <p>How powerful was Mussolini in Italy in the period from October 1922 to the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. At the higher levels candidates will need to address the issue of 'how powerful' and not simply produce a list of examples of power and weakness. Candidates may discuss the extent and nature of Mussolini's dictatorship. Candidates may refer to some of the following in developing their argument: Mussolini's consolidation of power after 1922, which may include some of the following; the Acerbo Law, Aventine Secession, abolition of the party system, the restrictions on the power of the monarchy, rule by decree, the fusion of state and party under the Duce. They may also refer to censorship, propaganda and other aspects of a police state (such as OVRA). To balance this they may also discuss the extent of Mussolini's control of the party, the continued existence of the monarchy, the need to come to agreement with the Church (Concordat), the inefficiency of the Fascist state. They might also consider the extent of popular support for the regime engendered through foreign policy success and economic developments which might have increased his power. However, some might contrast this with the superficial acceptance and support for fascism shown by the reaction to some of his social policies.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 18 | <p>'Mussolini's greatest foreign policy success was the conquest of Abyssinia.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. Even if candidates want to disagree with the proposition they must write a good paragraph on the named factor if they want to access Level III or above for AO1b. Some may argue that it was his greatest success as it created an Italian East African Empire and appeared to confirm, at least on the surface, that Italy was a great colonial power. Some may suggest that it was his greatest achievement as it gave Italians revenge for the defeat at Adowa in 1896 and appeared to fulfil Mussolini's claim to make Italy 'great, respected and feared.' However, the Abyssinian crisis may be viewed as a turning point – achievement of his aim of acquiring the country was qualified by the costs and the loss of British and French friendship. Some may also point to the difficulties Italy faced in conquering a weak nation. After 1935, increased cooperation (eg over involvement in the Spanish Civil War) and alliance with Germany undermined Italy's international prestige and led Italy into a war for which it was unprepared. Candidates should balance their discussion of Abyssinia against other events. Discussion in relation to the 1920s may refer to the Corfu Incident, the acquisition of Fiume and the Locarno Treaties as evidence of some limited success, but that attempts to assert Italy's pre-eminence in the Mediterranean failed. Candidates may argue that in the 1930s Mussolini's foreign policy became more assertive and defined, They may argue that Mussolini achieved a success in 1934 over Austrian independence, but that success in Abyssinia and the Spanish Civil War was limited and exposed Italian weakness.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 19 | <p>Assess the consequences of the 1911 Revolution to 1925.</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. The question requires candidates to consider a range of consequences but at higher levels they will need to evaluate the relative importance of factors. Answers that are simply a list of consequences will be limited to Level III for AO1b. Candidates will need to discuss and evaluate a range of consequences. In their assessment, candidates may discuss some of the following: the state of China in 1911; 'sudden' nature of the revolution in 1911 and resulting power vacuum; ambitions of Yuan Shikai; the limited authority of government and local power/rivalries of warlords (the significance of the warlords may be stressed); the extent and nature of support for Sun Zhongshan (Sun Yat-sen) and the Nationalists (party formed only in 1912); pressure from Japan; the significance of the 4 May Movement; Sun Zhongshan (Sun Yat-sen) and the reorganization of the Guomindang; Foundation of CCP. Candidates may argue that whilst the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty met little resistance, there was no consensus about the next step and that there was no one source of power able to assert its authority in the short term. In relation to the warlords, candidates may argue that the local power and the rivalry between warlords certainly made it difficult for political stability to be established, but may suggest that this was significant because of other reasons. Not until the 1920s were the nationalists in a position to establish their authority and this remained patchy. Some may argue that no really effective government was established until after 1949.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 20 | <p>'Jiang Jieshi (Chiang Kai Shek) was a failure as the Nationalist leader of China in the period from 1928 to 1949.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. At the higher levels candidates will need to consider the success and failures of Jiang Jieshi and reach a balanced conclusion. Candidates may discuss some of the following aspects: the establishment of a Nationalist state symbolised by capital at Nanking (but varied extent of authority of Nationalists in areas away from key centres); his failure to deal with communists and forced mutual action against Japan after 1937; comparison with warlord years; lack of democracy and corruption, lack of support; the degree of economic progress (industry, transport) and limited social reform (education, New Life Movement, women); the failure to help peasants; his eventual defeat. Candidates may argue that Jiang's main aims were to hold on to power and to crush the communists and that whilst he did the former until the late 40s, he failed in the latter. However, Jiang and the Nationalists never enjoyed full control of China – any success was relative to the chaos of the warlord years. Candidates may consider Jiang Jieshi's aims and priorities, the context in which the Nationalists were operating; corruption; failure to deliver on promised policies; poor performance in war with Japan; his failure to deal with communists; lack of democracy; the limited degree of economic progress (industry, transport) and limited social reform (education, New Life Movement, women). Some response may argue that he had some successes in areas such as defeating the warlords, promoting industry and investment and continuing the struggle against Japan.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 21 | <p>How successful was the Communist government in its domestic policies in the 1950s and early 1960s?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. At the higher levels candidates will need to address the issue of 'how successful' and not simply produce a list of examples of power and weakness. The question allows candidates to consider a range of domestic policies, but is likely that many will focus on social and economic issues. Candidates may distinguish between initial economic policies, progress towards collectivisation and the first Five Year Plan (1952 – 56). Candidates may point to initial successes in controlling inflation, reforming the currency and the continuity of industry through the employment of existing managers and businessmen. Candidates may also discuss the impact of land seizures, attacks on landlords (The results of the first five year plan, for example, were impressive, but heavily dependent on Soviet aid and support; the middle classes were attacked and denounced and maybe a million landlords in the countryside were killed) and the encouragement of collectives (over 750,000 by 1956) and then the enforcement of communes. Mao's belief in mass effort by the peasantry to revolutionise China's industrial and agricultural production was hopelessly unrealistic, for example, the weaknesses of 'backyard furnaces', the limited success of the State Owned Enterprises, the weaknesses of Lysenkoism, 'sparrowcide', the collapse in food production and the 'three hard years' (50 million dead). On the other hand 'the blue ants' did achieve some impressive feats in creating canals, bridges, dams etc. through manual labour. Success may be assessed against, aims, outcomes and context. They should also discuss the aims and outcomes of the First Five Year Plan. In relation to the Great Leap Forward candidates may point to some impressive results and the lasting legacy of self-reliance, communes etc. However, they are more likely to argue that the Great Leap Forward was a failure because its approach to economic policy was misconceived and targets were not rooted in sound economic analysis. In terms of political policies some may discuss the consolidation of power of the Communist party, whilst in discussing social issues there may be consideration of education policies and the success or otherwise of propaganda. Some may argue that the introduction of the Cultural Revolution suggests concerns and possible earlier failures, but examiners should not over-reward responses that go too far into the 1960s.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 22 | <p>'Political instability was not a serious problem for Weimar Germany in the 1920s.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. At the higher levels candidates should address the issue of 'not a serious problem' and not simply provide a list of challenges to the Republic. The question refers to the 1920s and examiners should therefore be aware of answers that focus on the Spartacist rising of 1919. Candidates may assess events such as the Kapp and Munich putsches as well as unrest stimulated by the French invasion of the Ruhr and assess how easily these were dealt with. There might be some discussion of the nature of the constitution and whether it created instability, in particular candidates might discuss the implementation of proportional representation and the number of small parties and link this to the difficulty in achieving majorities and hence the large number of coalitions. Some may also suggest that instability was a constant feature as there was limited support for the Republic and many wanted a return to the Kaiser. Some might discuss the attitudes of Presidents or Chancellors towards the Republic. Candidates might consider the economic problems and this is acceptable provided they are linked to political instability; for example the economic results of hyperinflation may have led to the loss of middle class support for the Republic as they blamed it for the loss of their savings. Candidates may suggest that the Weimar system was compromised by the failure of the democratic political parties to work together in dealing with the economic depression (citing, for instance, the break-up of the Grand Coalition) and their failure to unite against the Nazi (and Communist) threat. Some candidates might also point to the continued support for the anti democratic parties, reflected in election results in the 1920s, although this might be balanced against the lack of support for the Nazis in the 1920s.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 23 | <p>To what extent was popular support the most important reason why the Nazis remained in power from 1933 to 1945?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. Even if candidates want to disagree with the proposition they must write a good paragraph on the named factor if they want to access Level III or above for AO1b. In considering popular support candidates may focus on the economic policies of the Nazis and argue that the provision of jobs did win popular support, but they might also consider the popularity of Nazi foreign policy in overturning Versailles. Candidates may also refer to the apparent benefits of Nazi rule: the end of the communist threat, the restoration of 'order', employment and economic recovery, and foreign policy successes. In relation to economic recovery, candidates may refer to the Nazis' apparent success in dealing with unemployment, and the recovery seen in many areas of economic activity. However, they may qualify the role of this apparent success by reference to the weaknesses apparent in the Nazi economy. They may well argue, therefore, that other factors are as or more important in explaining the Nazi hold on power. Many will stress the role played by terror, and here candidates may discuss the role and significance of the SS, Gestapo, concentration camps, political and other persecution, the nazification of government and judiciary, and censorship and propaganda. In relation to terror, candidates are likely to discuss various aspects of the police state such as the roles of censorship and propaganda, the nazification of the judicial system, the use of arbitrary imprisonment and the roles of the SS, Gestapo and concentration camps. They may also point to the stifling of political opposition with the arrest of communists and social democrats and the 'law' banning other political parties. However, candidates may balance their discussion of these areas with the role of indoctrination, the attempts to control all aspects of people's lives (with reference to the German Labour Front, Strength through Joy, the Hitler Youth etc.). There may also be discussion of other factors that contributed to the Nazis' hold on power: the establishment of order of a kind after the chaos of the twenties and the Depression years, the attractions of some of the Nazis' social reforms and the success of Hitler's foreign policy. Some answers may discuss the impact of the war on support for the regime.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 24 | <p>How far were the western powers responsible for the division of Germany in 1949?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue other factors were more significant. Candidates may discuss some of the following issues in relation to whom was to blame: the Yalta Conference (Germany to be divided into zones of occupation), the Potsdam Conference (reparations issues), perceptions of Britain, USA, France and the Soviet Union on the future of Germany, wider context of Cold War developments (including Soviet consolidation in Eastern Europe, Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, Cominform and Comecon, communist coup in Czechoslovakia), the creation of a Soviet friendly 'Socialist Unity Party' (SED), creation of Bizonia, the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers (1947), the London Conference, new currency, the Berlin Blockade, NATO, creation of FRG and GDR. In arguing that the western allies were responsible candidates might suggest that this was because they were unwilling to see Germany fall under Soviet influence and therefore pushed their own separate agenda. Candidates may argue that because of Cold War tensions the creation of a divided Germany was almost inevitable. Candidates may argue that it is possible to build a case against the Soviet Union, because of its reluctance to agree to a united Germany on the western model, ideological perspective and security fears.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 25 | <p>'The rearmament of West Germany was the most important cause of the development of tensions over Germany.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. Even if candidates want to disagree with the proposition they must write a good paragraph on the named factor if they want to access Level III or above for AO1b. Candidates will need to explain a number of reasons and assess their relative significance and linkages to score well. In discussing the named factor candidates might consider the concerns of the Soviet Union about the rearmament of Germany following two invasions in the twentieth century and this might also be linked to the question of Soviet security and concerns about West Germany joining NATO. In assessing reasons, candidates may discuss some of the following: the significance of the decision to divide Berlin into four zones; the strategic position of Berlin in the Soviet zone; the reasons for and consequences of the Berlin Blockade in 1948; the division of Germany, the acceptance of West Germany into NATO, the significance of West Berlin as an island of capitalism/western shop window and as the front-line in the Cold War; the stream of refugees to the West; the decision to build the Berlin Wall and its impact in the context of the failure of the Paris summit and the U2 spy plane incident. Candidates may focus on the two crises surrounding the Berlin Blockade and the building of the Berlin Wall, as well as the division of Germany.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 26 | <p>How successfully did the Soviet Union deal with challenges to its power in Eastern Europe in the period from 1956 to 1981?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. At the higher levels candidates will need to address the issue of 'how successfully' and not simply produce a list of examples of power and weakness. They may discuss particular developments such as the problems in East Germany, Poland and Hungary in the 1950s and the Prague Spring of 1968. However, they may place such discussion in the broader context of the issue for Soviet leaders in balancing control against local situations and reform, the impact of the Cold War and the impact of de-Stalinisation. Candidates may discuss individual crises and the threat they posed to the stability of Soviet controlled Eastern Europe more generally and here there may be developed treatment of Hungary in 1956, the problem of refugees and the building of the Berlin Wall and the Dubcek regime in Czechoslovakia. They may argue that in some ways the threats posed by nationalist and 'liberal' pressures were more or less effectively dealt with, pointing to the clampdowns in Poland and Hungary, for example, in 1956. However, they may qualify this by suggesting that the USSR's freedom of action was widened by the refusal of the West to get involved, and by the limited means available to protesters in the face of the Red Army or, in Poland's case, state authorities. They may make similar points in relation to the Czech crisis of 1968 and also point to the development of the Brezhnev doctrine. Candidates may well argue that the Soviet Union dealt with the threats very successfully insofar as opposition was crushed or the problem effectively minimized. However, candidates may also suggest that Soviet intervention in Eastern Europe failed to win popular support and that short term successes hid longer term problems.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 27 | <p>Assess the main reasons why the Cold War came to an end in Europe.</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. The question requires candidates to consider a range of reasons but at higher levels they will need to evaluate the relative importance of factors. Answers that are simply a list of reasons will be limited to Level III for AO1b. There are a number of reasons that candidates might consider and this could include issues such as the problems within the Soviet economy which meant it could not maintain its armaments spending and this might be linked to the development of SDI. The issue of armaments and cost might also be linked to the Soviet problems in Afghanistan and the desire to withdraw. Some might argue that it was the arrival in power of Gorbachev and his policies, particularly perestroika and glasnost that brought about an end to the Cold War. There were also problems within the satellite states of Europe and candidates might discuss the rise of Solidarity and developments in other states, such as the fall of the Berlin Wall. There might also be consideration of the events of 1989 in Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Romania. The role of Reagan and Thatcher in bringing about the end might also be considered.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 28 | <p>Assess the reasons for the success of Nasser in the Suez Crisis (1956).</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. The question requires candidates to consider a range of reasons but at higher levels they will need to evaluate the relative importance of factors. Answers that are simply a list of reasons will be limited to Level III for AO1b. There are a number of reasons that candidates might consider and this could include the attitudes of the USA and the USSR, particularly lack of US support for Britain and France. Candidates might also explain how the crisis developed as this had a direct impact on the outcome. In particular candidates might consider the US response to the actions of Britain, France and Israel. There were direct concerns for the US president Eisenhower as he was in the middle of an election campaign and he was also concerned that the USSR might see the crisis as an excuse to intervene in the Middle East. This explains the US decision to propose a UN Security Council resolution, which although defeated only resulted in a resolution to the General Assembly which was approved by 64 votes to 5. The Soviets also made it known that they might take action against Israel. The US put pressure on Britain, threatening to cut its oil supplies, withdraw US funds from London banks and block loans from the IMF to aid Britain's depleted sterling reserves. These actions forced Britain to inform France it would no longer support action. Candidates might therefore argue it was the US who allowed Nasser to triumph, although other may suggest it was the threat of Soviet intervention. Other candidates might argue that Nasser had been able to exploit divisions, particularly US attitudes to Empire and therefore his nationalisation was always likely to succeed. Candidates might also consider the strengths of Nasser, his success and opportunism.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 29 | <p>'The development of Israeli settlements was the most important reason for the difficulties in achieving a solution to the Palestinian question from 1973 to 2003.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. Even if candidates want to disagree with the proposition they must write a good paragraph on the named factor if they want to access Level III or above for AO1b. Candidates will need to explain a number of reasons and assess their relative significance and linkages to score well. The issue of the increased numbers of Jewish settlers in the West bank became one of the thorniest problems between Israelis and Palestinians and candidates should discuss the growth of Israeli settlement of West Bank and Gaza. The settlements on Palestinian land appear to show Israeli expansion and an attack on the autonomy of the areas. Candidates may also discuss the policies and attitude of the PLO, the significance of the Six Day War and Resolution 242. The issue of the Palestinians was, of course, also bound up with the other causes of distrust and friction within the Middle East. Candidates may consider Israel's distrust of the Palestinians and their opposition to the Israeli state. They may argue that Israel has had to be pushed to the negotiating table by US pressure and its willingness to make concessions has been limited. Equally candidates may point to Palestinian excesses. In coming to a judgement candidates may discuss some of the following: the impact of the 1973 war; the role the PLO and Arafat; Munich 1972; the policies of Begin after 1977 and the 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the Sabra-Chatila massacres; the post-1985 'Iron Fist' policy; the roles of Islamic Jihad, Hamas and other radical Palestinian groups; the Intifada post 1987; PLO acceptance of UN resolution 242 and renunciation of terrorism; US involvement and refusal of Israel to negotiate; post-1991 US-Soviet brokered talks in Madrid / Washington; the Oslo Accords, Oslo 2 and Arafat's return to Gaza; the Wye River talks linking Israeli withdrawal to action against Hamas and Islamic Jihad; Camp David and renewed violence, the second Intifada; Bush and the Road map.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 30 | <p>How successful was the intervention of Western powers in Iraq in the period from 1991 to 2003?</p> <p>No set answer is required but candidates must answer the question set. At the higher levels candidates will need to address the issue of 'how successful' and not simply produce a list of examples of success and failure. Candidates may argue that on the surface the intervention of western powers appears to have been very successful as in both instances Hussein has been defeated and in the first instance was driven out of Kuwait, the initial goal and that by 2003 he had been removed. Candidates are not expected to consider the consequences beyond 2003. Some candidates may argue that success should be judged against the aims of the western powers and if this was to overthrow Hussein and bring stability to the region then a different perspective is needed. They did remove Hussein in 2001, but have failed to bring stability and it may be argued have made the region less stable and point to growing support for jihad and radical Islam. There might also be some discussion as to whether western intervention resulted in an improved position for persecuted groups within Iraq. Some might discuss the concerns that intervention created both in the Arab world and the wider Muslim community. There might be some discussion of the success or otherwise of inspection teams after the First Gulf War. Some might also argue that the First War was a failure as Hussein's control appeared to get stronger and he was able to act ruthlessly against the Shi'ah opponents in the south. Some may argue that intervention had been responsible for increased terror attacks and therefore should be seen as unsuccessful. There might also be some consideration about the failure of the propaganda campaign of the west in terms of WMD.</p> | 50 | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2015

