

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F964/02**: European and World History Enquiries. Option B Modern 1774-1975

Mark Scheme for June 2012

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, 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 2012

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

Subject-specific Marking Instructions that apply across the whole question paper to be included here.

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>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
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"> • 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>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
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	Ao2a and b
Total mark for the question = 70	<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>
Level 1	<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>
Level 2	<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>

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Level 3	<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>
Level 4	<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>
Level 5	<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>

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question. • Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant. • Little organisation or structure with poor communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation. • A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content. • No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">7-13</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question. • No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context. • Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive. • No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately. • No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince. <p style="text-align: center;">0-6</p>

The Origins and Course of the French Revolution 1774-95

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>Similarities: Both A (The declaration of the nobles) and B (Sieyès) agree that the nobles have privileges. The fact that in A they are blocking reform in the Assembly of Notables supports the view in B that they have power and dominate the King. They argue in A that they should control the presidency of assemblies and B argues that they are a caste whose power is total – that they are going against the interests of the King and people. They seem intent on showing just that in A.</p> <p>Differences: A justifies power and privilege by a view of a hierarchical society in which the nobles fight, the clergy celebrates mass and the magistrates judge. B rejects this order and suggests that instead the nobility have become a narrow caste working against the best interests of France. A has them as a key support; B has them as a foreign element in the body politic rather than part of an organic traditional society.</p> <p>Provenance: A is written when privilege is under threat by a reforming minister and a king who needs to increase revenue and restrict financial privilege. While many of the nobles accepted the need for change – making A perhaps not entirely typical – the reform proposals of 1787 were not carried. B comes from a later period, when class resentment is more acute and expectations of a far greater change from the Estates General were widespread. It comes from a famously rhetorical pamphlet arguing the case for a proper national assembly, not a feudally arranged Estates General which could veto the opinion of the majority, including the King. In a sense B is a comment on the lack of wisdom shown in 1787 when the privileged classes could have led and controlled reform far more than was the case in 1789. The intention of A is to preserve the old order; the intention of B is to institute social change and oppose what was seen as aristocratic domination. Both reflect a degree of frustration – the nobles in A that they are being held responsible for wider crown problems; B the social frustrations felt by the middle classes and the lower clergy that their economic and intellectual importance was not being recognized by a state still dominated by privilege. The context has changed between 1787 and 1789 with a greater degree of economic and social discontent and political radicalism.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u></p> <p>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.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Judgement :By 1787 A is not necessarily typical or reliable evidence for what the role of the nobility should be in that many no longer thought of this very rigid and privileged system as being viable and permanent – though the nobility did dominate higher ranks in the armed forces, However, the claims made in B may be seen as overstated. The idea of the nobility ‘reigning’ may also be challenged. There had been many efforts by the royal government to introduce reforms of privilege and there were nobles who were concerned with reform and modernization for the national good. Both were written with a distinct purpose at a time of possible change.</p>		
(b)	<p>The issues are whether social tensions and resentment of the aristocracy were the key to revolution and whether the failure of the aristocracy to change and adapt was crucial or whether broader political ideas and the failure of royal government to solve key financial problems were more important and whether the nobles by opposing the king and by adopting radical philosophical ideas brought about their own downfall.</p> <p>Noble responsibility for the situation is primarily to be found in B, D and E. The nobles are blamed in B for holding on to selfish privileges and they are blamed for the opposite reason in E (d’Espinchal’s journal) and from a different perspective for giving in. D (de Bouille’s memoirs) also blames the rich nobility for obstructing financial reforms before 1789.</p> <p>An alternative view is to be found in D (de Bouillé’s Memoirs) which takes a broader view, blaming financial problems, putting noble selfishness into the context of a widespread avoidance of responsibility by the rich – towns and provinces, the clergy as well as the nobles – but the root cause is lack of money linked to war.</p> <p>A third view, C (Arthur Young), blames the weakness of the King in the face of mob pressure. Thus weaknesses at the top caused a revolutionary situation by late June 1789.</p> <p>In terms of provenance, D (Bouillé) and E (Espinchal) are seeing the significance of the events of June in retrospect and from the point of view of nobles who have seen the consequences of revolution. Both went into exile and E is bitter about the nobles who gave way, while D is critical of the richer classes as a whole, including the nobles. However, it could either be seen that the liberal nobles were trying to go forward in a spirit of national unity and</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>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.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>conciliation or that they were, as C suggests, put in an impossible position by popular unrest and the weakness of Louis XVI. The author of C was there at the time, but is a foreign observer with a critical view of the concession to the 'mobs'. Criticisms of the nobles here do not show the enlightened and liberal elements in the nobility that themselves in their cahiers supported reform although de Bouille suggests he takes this view. On the other hand, B implies that there was the perception of a selfish and 'foreign' caste. This was a propaganda piece by a keen political activist and should be seen in context of a great deal of political excitement and expectation and a barrage of pamphleteering rather than a considered piece of social analysis. Again it ignores the liberal nobility and the elements among the aristocracy castigated in A that wanted change. The strongest counter view is in D which points to the problems faced in finance and by entrenched privileges. This is a view that was published with hindsight and is by a noble consciously blaming all sorts of privileged groups in France and not just the Second Estate. Contextual knowledge may well confirm this, but this may be seen as an attempt to shift the blame. Candidates may use contextual knowledge of financial problems and may discuss whether it was the nobles who blocked necessary change or use the evidence in C for the weakness of the King in failing to push reform through. Contextual knowledge of the spread of enlightened and liberal ideas could also be applied to consideration of E. Both D and E are evidence that the nobles were not united, with D seeming to take a more progressive attitude even after the Revolution than E. The intransigence in A is confirmed by D and E.</p> <p>In terms of knowledge, there could be understanding shown of the context of the Assembly of Notables and the Estates General, of the implications in financial terms of the maintenance of the privileges of the nobility given the large debt and the costs of the American War. There could be understanding shown of the 'revolt of the nobles' and of the influence Enlightenment ideas had on the nobility. There could be however, expansion of the feelings of the middle classes expressed in B and these could be cross-referenced with the wider problems dealt with in D to support an argument about the extent of noble responsibility</p>		

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		No set conclusion is looked for, but candidates could use the sources to argue that by a mixture of obduracy about privilege and opposition to the crown the nobles were the key factor. They both provoked resentment and also failed to support ideas for change. Some may argue by using sources A and E that it was the nobles' failure to resist change and some flirting with reforming ideas that they brought about revolution. Others may use the evidence to argue that other elements were of much greater importance, especially the persistent failure of the King and his ministers- not all aristocrats – to deal with long-term problems and the climate created by the enlightenment or the economic problems that were greater than social order issues.		
2	(a)	<p>Agreement rather than difference is central to this comparison. Opposition to Austria is recognised in both sources. Source B acknowledges that there is 'discontent' and 'opponents of the existing order' whilst Source C agrees the 'nobility and clergy have lost all friendly feeling' to Austria with opposition based on a loathing of an 'undemocratic government' and 'Germanic forms of government which undermines their attachment to the Empire'. Indeed, both sources concede the potential for opposition to spill over into insurrection. Although Source B regards the risk as low level, nonetheless, 'opponents... may be easily led to disturb the peace' especially considering attitudes to 'foreign powers' and the 'dangers to the peace of Italy' they pose. Source C confirms this danger by acknowledging that there was 'unrest in Naples'. There is agreement that Austrian power would be best served by policies that take into account the local people. Source B suggests it is 'best ... to leave them to themselves' while Source C explains that this was the approach favoured by the Emperor who thought 'his Italian peoples should not be subjected to laws unsuited to their needs'. Austrian power is considered secure in Piedmont. In Source B 'a revolutionary movement is not expected' and Source C 'cannot see any immediate peril in Piedmont' (or the Papal States).</p> <p>In evaluating the reliability of the sources candidates might emphasise the authority of the views expressed based as they are on information from those in Italy with direct observation of the position there. On the other hand candidates might question the reliability of one or the other given their relationship with Metternich. Whilst both authors may have the interests of</p>	30	Focus: Comparison of two Sources. 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.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Austria at heart candidates might regard both accounts as self-serving. Metternich's assessment presents a positive view of Austria's position which was to his advantage as this would more likely gain him credit with the Emperor whilst the Governor's view is less sanguine and implies some criticism of central government and by implication Metternich which may be regarded as more reliable given his observations at first hand although it may be inferred from the last sentence that he was mildly critical of central government. This difference of perspective may be accounted for by the dates of the reports. In 1817 the activities of secret societies were timid whereas in 1820 the subversion of the Carbonari in Naples was clear evidence that they were more potent a threat than previously thought. Source B might be considered more useful than Source C as the latter is more concerned with Austria's 'Italian possessions' rather than Italy as a whole. Yet the utility of both sources could be questioned given the clear failure of both to appreciate the situation in Piedmont which erupted in revolution in March 1821 with the abdication of Victor Emmanuel I. Indeed, the unrest in Naples was more serious than Source C seems to suggest and Austrian intervention was required there.</p>		
(b)	<p>Some sources may be used to support more than one view. As such, a thematic approach would work well. Firstly, unification had little chance of success because Austria was a major obstacle. Knowledge of the political arrangements made in 1815 would verify this. Austria's military might is stressed in Source C which emphasises the importance of 'physical force' to uphold her possessions in Italy. Candidates might explain how Austria's army restored order in Sicily and Naples, picking up on the reference to 'unrest in Naples' and later in Piedmont. Source D refers to 'Austrian intervention' as a regular response to disturbances in this period. The motives of Austria and Metternich might be considered. <i>On the other hand</i>, it could be argued that Austrian influence had its limits and even stimulated the movement for Italian unification. In Source C the Governor of Lombardy concedes that Austria risked alienating its Italian subjects with their laws. Furthermore, Source B confirms that Austrian power was challenged by secret societies, even if their effectiveness was difficult to measure. The confidential nature and frank acceptance of the problems facing Austria revealed in Sources B and C might be evaluated as sound evidence.</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u> 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.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>A division between Italians is another theme. The judgements made in Sources A and B suggest divisions meant Italian unification had little chance of success. Source B considers the divisions between different revolutionary groupings were such that it is 'best ... to leave them to themselves'. Source A highlights the regional divisions in Italy arguing 'the union of its nations will be difficult' citing the example of Genoa and Piedmont. The evidence of these sources derives from Italians themselves and might be considered reliable as a result, although some candidates might argue that the author of Source A might reflect a certain arrogance associated with the Piedmontese or at least detect the conservatism of Source A. Does Source C's comment on the three estates indicate social divisions? <i>On the other hand</i>, a degree of unity is revealed in the sources. Indeed, a sense of nationalism is evident in most sources. Source A stresses 'the Italian spirit' which is active' and its potential to challenge the 'Italian arrangements' made at Vienna. Source C comments on the nationalism of the Lombards which was aroused by 'Austrian' imperialism. Candidates may elaborate: Milan was a centre of intellectuals and publications of a radical nature. The author of Source D implies that 'the more intelligent people' want to see change even if, as stated in Source E, the middle and upper classes were conservative in their interests. Source B admits that 'the prospect of Italian independence' was a motivating force capable of galvanising opponents.</p> <p>The quality of leadership of the Italian cause is another reason why it had little chance of success. Source B is the main point of reference. This suggests that the secret societies 'lack leaders of character' and skills of organisation. This is firmly supported by Source D and E which criticise the revolutions of the period as 'futile' and 'easily suppressed' with scorn for Young Italy. Both suggest revolution of all kinds was counterproductive. The ineptitude of the revolutionaries, especially in the revolts of 1820 could be considered. <i>On the other hand</i>, it can be argued that the leadership of the movement for Italian unification had some strengths. In Source C it is made clear that there were those prepared to take the initiative and fight for the cause citing the 'unrest in Naples'. Further, the reference to the Pope in Source D gives candidates the chance to comment on the positive fillip to the cause provided by the election of Pius IX and the apparent willingness of Charles Albert to fight for 'the cause</p>		

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		in Italy'. This is implied by Cavour in Source E when referring to 'monarchs with roots in the national soil'. The moderate politics of the two authors might be evaluated to explain their stance. Candidates might comment on the uneven record of Charles Albert in support of the Italian cause in 1821 and subsequently as monarch from 1831.		
3	(a)	<p>There is agreement on several points. Both argue the central government was partisan. In Source A the North is accused of 'absolute control of the Government' and of sacrificing the interests of the South to those of the North, a charge supported in Source D which claims 'the Government has acted against the interests of the South'. Discontent was also based on the perception of the South about the attitude of the North to the social organisation of the South. Source A suggests 'the positions of the two sections on the relation between the two races of the South' are opposed and Source D complains that 'Northern States have denounced the institution of Slavery as sinful'. This is developed in both sources with Source A asserting that the 'movement to abolish slavery was started by Northern fanatics' and Source D refers to the support of Northern States for 'societies whose object is the end of slavery'. The tone of Source D is, however, much bleaker than that of Source A and indicates a deeper discontent. Source A is unhappy with the situation but is not without hope that a solution could be found. On the other hand, Source D makes it clear that, as of 4 March, 'the equal rights of the States will be lost' and is despairing.</p> <p>The extent of the agreement between the sources can be attributed, in part, to the fact that both views are those of southerners and, specifically, South Carolinians. Candidates should be able to explain that southern hostility to the north was more vocal and active in South Carolina than other southern states. In evaluating Source A candidates might explain how Calhoun had long been an advocate of States Rights and a leading figure in defining the principle of 'nullification'. Further, in evaluating Source D candidates should be able to point out that South Carolina was the first to secede in 1860, indicating the radicalism of its politics. Some might link this to the serious intention of the State to secede from the Union in 1832. The timing of the sources is also worthy of note in the evaluation of their content. Source A should be seen in</p>	30	Focus: Comparison of two Sources. 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.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>the context of the debates of 1850 and was intended as a contribution to the eventual Compromise between North and South. Source D was announced after the election of Lincoln as President, who failed to gain any support in South Carolina, and whose inauguration on 4 March was expected to mark the beginning of a period that would be negative for the South. Both sources reliably represent the discontent of the South if set in context.</p>		
(b)	<p>Perhaps the most convincing evidence to support the interpretation lies in Sources B and E. The attack by Brooks on Sumner (Source B) was, surely, symbolic of the bitterness of the divide between North and South and the willingness of politicians, such as Brooks and the Southern Senators who are shown to be supportive of the latter, to use violence to achieve their aims. Candidates may argue that events in Kansas, which lay behind Brookes' action, highlighted the responsibility of the South for the sectional divide. However, it is clear that in condemning the Southern politicians with his cynical reference to 'Southern Chivalry' and the smiling faces of the Southern Senators that the cartoonist's interpretation of the event is partisan. Indeed, the actions of 'free-soilers' and John Brown's murder of pro-slavery settlers at Pottawatomie Creek could be used to argue that the North was more responsible for the divide.</p> <p>Candidates may stress the evidence of Source E as supportive of the interpretation. In referring to 'a minority will secede' Lincoln is acknowledging the reality that southern states had broken from the Union and as such implicitly blames the South for the situation. In claiming 'the Union of the States is perpetual', that the sections 'physically ... cannot separate' or 'build an impassable wall between our respective sections' Lincoln is emphasising his commitment (and that of the North) to keep the two sections together. He is keen to stress that the actions of the South 'will divide and ruin them'. Yet, there is an optimism in the passage which may be explained by the obligation Lincoln felt to be conciliatory on the occasion of his inauguration, hence his reassurance that 'no section is endangered by the incoming administration' and his sincere commitment to the Union illustrated by 'we are friends not enemies'.</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>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.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Sources A and D seem to blame the North for the sectional divide. Source A accuses the North of dominating Government and sacrificing the interests of the South to those of the North. It also accuses ‘Northern fanatics’ of starting the abolition movement with the result that ‘the two sections ... as opposite as they can be’ at least on the issue of relations between the races. Lastly, it charges the North with ‘the responsibility for saving the Union’. Some candidates will comment on the provenance in assessing the reliability of the source with links to Calhoun’s involvement in the Nullification Crisis of 1829-33 and his views on State rights. Reference to the Missouri Compromise of 1820 as an example, for Southerners at least, of the dangers of compromise would be admissible in explaining the context of his remarks. Source D presents very similar views. The pitch of the source is pessimistic and resigned, with trust in the North clearly exhausted in the accusations of treachery by the North in ‘encouraging slaves to leave their homes’ and to ‘have incited insurrection’ and the prospect of worse to follow from the presidency of Lincoln. These sentiments may be dismissed as the views of a minority as South Carolina seceded alone initially but candidates will know that the lead of South Carolina was critical in persuading other states to do the same later.</p> <p>Candidates may have differing views about Source C. Taken at face value it seems to merely describe the characteristics of the two sections without apportioning blame one way or the other. Further, his comments appear rather contradictory as he talks of ‘a more perfect social unity’ but also suggesting that conflict was inevitable, made explicit in the final sentence. This is explained by the forces of change – ‘increase of population, new transport and more internal trade’ which brought ‘antagonistic systems’ ... to ‘collision’. Knowledge of the economic, commercial and social developments of the time could be brought to bear. However, candidates may use the introduction to suggest the author regarded the South as responsible for the sectional divide given his hostility to slavery. Further, many will appreciate that Seward had always opposed compromise speaking out against it in the debates of 1850, for example.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)	<p>The Sources are similar in that they both blame the West for the problems that have arisen. In Source A, an official GDR government statement, West Berlin and German capitalists egged on by Foreign Powers (the US and GB?) are the culprits and in D, an official Communist report, it is western music, especially from the UK and US which is responsible for unrest. Both suggest that as the Government is improving the lives of its people the protests are needless, although this is more explicit in Source A than in Source E.</p> <p>The Sources also differ. Source A condemns the discontent as being politically fascist in nature, a convenient term of abuse and in 1953 a nasty, recent memory. The Source also emphasises the positive achievements of the GDR, which should negate such protests. Source D has more to say in lambasting the immoral nature of groups which incite young people to excess and to riotous behaviour. It links communist morality with political ideals and decency. There is no direct reference to the benefits being bestowed by the state, since its support of civilised dance music was unlikely to be credited by the disaffected youth.</p> <p>The provenance and context of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both Sources have an official origin, although Source A has a more general application. Source D refers to a major city, where Western culture was more likely to have an impact and is a report trying to address the issues with an attempt to show some sympathy with youth interests but in a clumsy and unconvincing way. By 1963 Western Culture was penetrating rapidly behind the Iron Curtain and was seen as a real problem in Source D, compared with Source A which was written ten years earlier when this was less of an issue and post war economic problems were more prevalent. Candidates might argue that both Sources show unrealistic attitudes in the GDR, but equally very predictable views. They might feel that the GDR shows a lack of discrimination in using equally violent language about protests which could be viewed as a real threat given its links with the Berlin working class and about teenage discontent, a less vital form of opposition, albeit potentially more insidious for the future.</p>	30	<p>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The Sources contain references to different interpretations, so they may be grouped according to their view. The supporting view, that life was improving is found in most of the Sources, but especially in B, a West German newspaper, whereas the opposing view, that it was not necessarily better is found in Sources A, a report from the GDR, C, from a West German newspaper, D, another official Communist report and E, another West German newspaper. Most of the Sources therefore contain evidence for both points of view.</p> <p>The supporting view is explained in most of the Sources as they argue that standards of living were rising. Source A makes direct reference to improving the situation. Source B, the most positive of the Sources, emphasises the good housing, attractive setting, abundance of food and wide-ranging educational opportunities in a new town. Source C is less positive but does show that some people did get cheap holidays. Even Source D suggests the government is not hostile to snappy rhythms, and does imply that western culture was penetrating East Germany. How far this could be considered an improvement is open to a variety of interpretations, while Source E, though critical of the appearance of the cities, shows that there were extensive building programmes being carried out in areas which had suffered severely in WWII.</p> <p>The opposing view is quite strongly presented as well. Source A indicates that there was opposition and thus, presumably, a lack of recognition that improvements were being made. Source C shows that not many workers could have a holiday and that the unemployed did not qualify. In 1963 most Europeans could enjoy this benefit so it is clearly not an improved situation for the most part. Source D strongly condemns the musical tastes of the youth of Leipzig and certainly argues that an interest in the Beatles is not part of a progressive life style. Source E argues that the drab uniform appearance of the cities is not an improvement. Candidates might argue that the obsession with Stalin in the naming of towns and with Moscow's architectural styles does not exemplify an improving situation.</p>	70	<p>Focus: Judgement in context based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, and limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing on the terms of the the question, but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p>The provenance and context of the Sources should be integrated into the discussion. Sources A and D are from official government bodies and so certainly represent the view of the GDR. A believes, even in 1953, that life was getting better. Sources B, C and D are all from West German newspapers, which might well be expected to be hostile. Hence the very positive appraisal in Source B is particularly valuable. The cheerfulness of the people is an unexpected description and the attitudes of the children contrast strongly with the youth of Leipzig in Source D. Sources C and E are more balanced and candidates can weigh up the facts, some enjoyed holidays but not all, some lived in uninspired surroundings but they did have houses. The title of Source E shows the outlook of the writer. Candidates might refer to the difficulties in making general conclusions from the evidence provided.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to suggest that the verdict of many East Germans differed from that of their government and the numbers risking their lives in order to leave East Berlin shows that their view was not that life was getting better. The building of the Berlin Wall could also be cited.</p>		
5	(a)	<p>The Sources are similar in that they agree that the USA's war strategy is weak. Source B states that the USA's 'withdrawal of 25,000 troops is the heaviest failure ever known' and Source C that 'American allies in Cambodia are weak militarily, economically and politically'. The changed context should be developed briefly to evaluate the extent of weakness. Both Sources mention US Vietnamisation policy, which should be explained in context, 'forced on them' in Source B and which 'may fail' in Source C. Source C also mentions US pacification policy which might be explained using own knowledge of belated US attempts to win over the rural population of South Vietnam with education and medical help. Source B refers to the USA using a puppet government and army against which the NV have struck back against in Source C. The Sources also refer to similar Vietnamese war strategies - destroying the South Vietnamese puppet government and army, politicising the peasants in a 'political struggle movement' and maintaining supply lines along the Ho Chi Minh trail. A 'general offensive' in Source B seems to be a consistent strategy, as towns and countryside are being targeted in Source C.</p>	30	<p>Focus: a comparison of Sources</p> <p>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. More than one side of the war should be mentioned for the top Level, but the <i>full</i> range of strategies in the Sources need not be developed exhaustively.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The Sources also have differences in content. Whereas in Source B a Vietnamese strategy is to deal with weaknesses by building up the main army and guerrilla forces, in Source C Nixon is said to admit that 'our liberation army is strong, sufficiently supplied and has high morale'. The war has broadened to Cambodia and Laos, so revolution and liberation there is additional strategy in Source C. Knowledge of US intervention there might be used to evaluate this war strategy.</p> <p>The provenance of the Sources should be cross-referenced in evaluation of these points. As the introduction states, Source B is written by the South Vietnamese COSVN, who have set themselves up as a communist government to rival Thieu, the US puppet ruler, showing a similar strategy to that of the USA. The nature of Source B is secret, with a propaganda purpose to encourage resistance to US Vietnamisation. In contrast, Source C is written when US policy has become more aggressive, with the invasions of Laos and Cambodia, and is an open, but internal communist party letter with a clearer propaganda purpose to keep up morale by asserting success. The USA sought peace, whereas the COSVN and North Vietnam sought victory. It might be inferred that COSVN was well established by 1970. Context might be used to develop the Sources, for example that Nixon's administration no longer believed in a 'total war' strategy and was forced by public opinion to seek peace. Both Sources are unreliable due to their purpose in building morale and have limited utility for US war strategies, but Source B might be judged the better evidence, as it sets out strategies rather than asserting their success. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The Sources argue in support of and against the argument, so they may be grouped accordingly. The supporting argument, concerning the Vietnamese is in Sources B, C and the steer to E, and concerning the USA in Sources C and E if taken at face value. The alternative argument, that the Vietnamese wished to stop fighting the war is in Source D, and that the USA wanted peace appears more prominently in Sources A and B, and in D if taken at face value.</p> <p>The argument that the Vietnamese wished to continue to fight is in Source B, the South Vietnamese COSVN, and in Source C, Hanoi culminating in the steer to Source E - the Spring Offensive of 1972. War plans suggest no desire to seek peace, but it might be questioned whether extensive Vietnamese apathy, and wavering foreign aid made them wish for peace in Source D. However, victory was their aim - a democratically elected communist government, to which the USA would never agree, so the content of Sources B, C and D together suggest the best option might have been to continue strengthening their position and fighting on.</p> <p>The argument in Sources A, B, and D if taken at face value, is that the USA did not wish to fight on. The context of Source A is Nixon's election promise to bring 'peace with honour' in light of the strong anti-war movement in the USA, adverse media coverage and the realisation that a US victory could not be won. Source A explains, to a wide TV audience of the US public, his policy of phased withdrawal and 'Vietnamisation', placing the burden of defence on the Thieu government and South Vietnamese forces. The address is propaganda, aiming to win over all sections of the public, who 'must unite' behind peace to save US reputation. Sources B and C refer to 'pacification' and 'Vietnamisation' to win over the South Vietnamese peasants as alternatives to fighting on. But it might be questioned whether this was ever a genuine desire for peace. The content and tone of Sources B and C, supported by knowledge, might be used to argue that atrocities and earlier policies such as forced relocation and chemical warfare had already alienated the Vietnamese.</p>	70	<p>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>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.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>However, Sources A and D have the alternative argument, that US peace terms were unrealistic showing a wish to continue fighting. In Source A, Nixon blames North Vietnam for the war, by influencing South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. He unrealistically asks it to withdraw its troops north of the 17th parallel demarcation line. Kissinger, in Source D, seems at face value to accept elections, but he will not allow replacement of the Saigon government before they are held. Use of contextual knowledge might suggest it unlikely that free elections would be held in South Vietnam. Neither the USA nor South Vietnam had signed the Geneva Accords. Previous attempts at democratic elections had been thwarted by the South for fears of an elected communist government. Certainly Thuy thinks that no fair elections can take place under Thieu's weak, unpopular, corrupt military regime.</p> <p>Sources C and E suggest that Nixon adopted an aggressive and forward policy and really wished to fight on. Source C mentions the US invasion of Cambodia and Laos, using weak allies to extend the theatre of war. Provenance should be integrated into Source evaluation. Source E is a private insight into Nixon as the 'Mad Bomber' after the launch of the North Vietnamese spring offensive. Knowledge might inform evaluation of this offensive and of the practicality of Nixon's threats, aimed to put pressure on North Vietnam to come to the conference table in light of Chinese and Soviet warming to peace talks. Knowledge of Kissinger's role, Nixon's volatility and his attempt to seek 'detente' with China might be used.</p> <p>Perhaps peace might be judged an unrealistic option and fighting on as the only course possible. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.</p>		

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 2012

