

Mark Scheme for June 2010

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

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

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

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

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

Notes related to Part A:

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

Marking Grid for Question (a)

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

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

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

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

Notes related to Part B:

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

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

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

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

1 The Origins and Course of the French Revolution 1774-95

(a) Study Sources C and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for class divisions in France by 1789. [30]

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

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

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

(b) Study all the Sources

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4 Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-63

(a) Study Sources B and D

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

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

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

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

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

(b) Study all the Sources

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) Study all the Sources

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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



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

© OCR 2010