

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

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

Mark Scheme for January 2013

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

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2013

Subject-specific Marking Instructions**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	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner. Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: <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>
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>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
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	A02a
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:

- (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

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
<p>Total for each 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; b. 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>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
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>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
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>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>Content: A common element in these Sources is the issue of the non-Juror priests. Source A refers to the unwillingness of the people of Thouare to give up their priests and they do not want priests who have sworn an oath to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. Similarly Source B refers to the sending of 'constitutional priests'. Source B is rather more explicit in linking the priests to the old ways – priests who have attended our fathers and baptised our infants; A on the same issue sees the issue of the priests as linked to the freedom of the people—denying non juror priests is 'a denial of freedom'. The issue of legitimacy is common – B says that the peasants could not submit to a government which had cast out our priests and imprisoned the king; however A does not mention the king and seems more generally in favour of the original revolution. A sees conscription and denial of religious freedom as an issue of legitimacy. There are some differences – in A the peasants say they have been forced into revolt; but B does not say this. B mentions the King while A is more concerned with the issue of recruitment. Both do refer to economic ills – A to the poverty of the countryside being made worse and B to the 'distress' the revolutionaries 'have brought to the countryside' but B is rather more broadly political and anti-revolutionary than A.</p> <p>Both sources refer to events in 1793, though one is looking back at a distance.</p> <p>Provenance: Differences may be explained by the nature of the evidence. A is a declaration. It may wish to show that the rebels had no choice and were generally peaceful but had been driven to revolt by the fears that conscription would impoverish the area and in defence of their religion. B is looking back from a traditional aristocratic view and may be justifying the revolt more in terms of sympathy for the king and for the crimes committed by the revolution rather more than just self-interest. She is possibly honouring the memory of her late husband and is not persuading anyone to take part in a rising as A is doing. A is justifying revolt ('forced to do so') and uses revolutionary terms ('Gentlemen and brothers'); B are memoirs post-revolution.</p> <p>Judgement That the religious issue appears in both sources written at different times for different purposes and for different reasons is an indication of this as a reliable cause and that both sources are equally useful or reliable, but the dislike of conscription for its own sake may be stronger than A suggests and B may be exaggerating the feeling for the King, noticeably absent in A.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus:</u> <u>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.....'</p> <p>The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The Sources which support the view are Sources C and E with some indications of economic distress in A while those which most support other motives will be Sources A, B and C.</p> <p>The most obvious link to economic distress is Source C stating the need for the poorer classes to be fed by revolutionary grain seizures and raids on the shops of larger cities. There is the issue of rising prices which need to be addressed in a revolutionary way and the hostility felt to the farmers and merchants. This is linked to Source E which claims that 'The means to live' is the one wish of the huge assembly of citizens. Like C this Source advocates armed revolutionary action to which there is bound to be a response.</p> <p>Less specific than C, Source D nevertheless sees one function of the revolutionary army as being to end 'avarice and greed', suggesting that economic hardship is driving militancy and class and political division. While there are references to poverty in D (the class enemy has not helped the poor) and in A and B's reference to some poverty in the countryside, the thrust of these Sources is to explaining divisions on other grounds. Candidates might know the economic background to the radicalism of 1793 that did provide a motivation for extremists – the resentment of the Sans-Culotte class to supposed hoarding and exploitation by farmers and larger merchants – the assignat-inflation and the economic disruption brought by revolution and war.</p> <p>However, divisions based on ideology were also strong. D on the revolutionary side and A and B on the counter-revolutionary side stress the role of religious and political ideals. Religion is clearly a strong element in both A and B, especially in the rural areas. The background to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy might be known to confirm the importance of this issue – which is referred to by Marat as well. The strains of war are seen in A with the dislike of conscription and also in D where Marat identifies the enemies of the people who should be taxed to pay for the war. The increasing anticlericalism of the revolution was making divisions wider by 1793 between the radicals of Paris and the Catholic provinces. What D shows, too, is the application of class hatred to all sorts of opposition. The definition of 'aristocrat' or enemy of the revolution is not made on grounds of birth but of behaviour and loyalty – so wishing to support the royalist exiles and avoiding 'constitutional priests' and even a failure to glorify the radicals and wear the right headgear (ie the bonnet of liberty) is indication of a broad attitude to revolution – here it is not primarily economic grievance but a failure to 'buy into the revolution'. Source E has elements of both. Though economic distress is first mentioned, the revolutionary armies have a number of ideals – the link between 'men of good will' and 'war against tyrants' as well as war against those who bring famine and 'protection of the weak. The origins of the Sources may be helpful to explain the differences. Only B is not an active contemporary, although someone clearly aligned with the counter-revolution. A is a declaration justifying revolt and may more accurately reflect the feeling in the counter-revolutionary west (pro-revolution but conservative religiously, and intensely local, fearing conscription and external</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>interference). C, D and E are all Paris-based and very aware of the need for popular support there. They may stress other ideological factors. The small masters and lower middle classes whom Hébert spoke for were opposed to supposed economic monopolists and exploiters, especially in a time of war. The appeal to material needs may be helpful to explain the differences. Only B is not actively involved in promoting a present cause, although counter-revolutionary. A is a declaration justifying revolt and may be stressing genuine motives. C, D and E are all Paris-based and very pro an extreme view of the revolution. The small masters and lower middle classes whom Hébert spoke for were opposed to supposed economic monopolists and exploiters, especially in a time of war. The appeal to material needs may be over-stressing this element in order to win support. D, Marat, is much less focused on economic motivation—what divides here is class, but the term 'aristocrat' is being applied to all sorts of enemies. Extreme division is not so much explained here by economic distress as the need for unity of attitude in time of war and the need for the radicals to brand their enemies as class enemies. This has to be seen in the light of the increasing radicalism of the capital, the 'revolutionary' war and the motivation of the newspaper. E too is persuading—to create a revolutionary army needed popular support and the army was associated with social justice and ideals and not merely the pressing need for more men for national defence. So C D and E may be linked more with revolutionary ideology, A and B more with the response of the provinces.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>Both agree that disorder was a problem. Brigands are blamed for this in both sources and both imply that the problem was serious. In Source A 'sixty battalions ... seem inadequate' to deal with the problem and Source B records the fact that 'the revolution of 1860 led to the outbreak of violence' which, he implies later in the passage, was still a problem. In addition, both concede that government policies were a cause of difficulty for in Source A they are acknowledged as 'wrong' and 'conscription' is cited in Source B as a policy that caused difficulties. Both acknowledge that there was no respect for authority. Source A suggests 'people do not want anything to do with the political system' and in Source B it is admitted that 'the criminal underworld is in charge'. However, the sources differ on a fundamental point. Source A rejects the use of force to resolve its difficulties claiming that 'we have no right to use guns' whereas Source B urges the application of 'overwhelming force'.</p> <p>Despite the points of similarity between the sources in evaluating the sources candidates may highlight the irony that the provenance of the sources differs markedly. In tone, Source A is clearly pessimistic about the situation and implies the government needs to adopt a more humble approach and effectively 'the Neapolitans must tell us what they want' whereas Source B is more optimistic and feels the difficulties can be overcome as 'time and the right measures will bring the desired result in Sicily'. This might be explained by the difference in the date of the sources in that Source A was written at a point when the disorder had just begun and the position looked very bleak whilst Source B acknowledges 'a little improvement can be seen' suggesting that things were less desperate three years later. However, it might be argued that the author of Source A had always opposed the annexation of the south and certainly opposed the use of force, made clear in the source, so he was more likely to emphasise the problems than the author of Source B who, as a military commander, had no such qualms. In addition, something might be made of the audience addressed. Source A was a confidential letter, so it would be reasonable to assume that the views expressed were sincere. However, the author of Source B was reporting to the Parliament and appears prepared to blame the politicians for the problem when he suggests the Parliament has not acted positively, possibly because he wishes to excuse the failure of the military to impose authority in the South.</p> <p>In making a judgement candidates may conclude that the motives of the authors may render their views slightly unreliable. Nonetheless, knowledge of the extent of the civil war in the south and the strength of local allegiances and hostility to Piedmontese conquest as it was widely regarded in Naples and Sicily, suggests that both sources provide useful evidence for the difficulties of governing the Southern regions and, to some extent, the different views in Piedmont about the best way to overcome these difficulties.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus:</u> <u>Comparison of two Sources.</u> 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>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Candidates will group the sources differently. Perhaps Sources D and E with elements of Source B from a different perspective provide support for the interpretation. Most candidates are likely to regard Source A as largely opposed to it together with some negative aspects of Sources B and E. Source C could also be treated one way or the other.</p> <p>Source D offers the most direct support for the interpretation even if not without reservations. In the final sentence he claims Italy has been created. Further, in the early part of the source he claims 'Italians are ready for any sacrifice' and that people want to 'reorganise the country'. To that end he recognises the need to address the country's problems especially illiteracy but he is confident that 'by instructing the new generation' 'we will make Italy'. His exhortation that 'a new war of internal conquest' is needed might be regarded as a hint that Italy was not united but it could equally simply indicate that despite unity much was needed to make it work. The political stand point of the author might be evaluated: as a nationalist was he exaggerating the degree of unity achieved at least by 1866? As a distinguished historian might his views be considered meretricious given his academic credentials?</p> <p>Also, evidence in Source B might be said to point to Italy as a united country in so far as this was regarded as plausible in the longer term: 'time and the right measures will bring the desired result'. Traces of a similar optimism might be discerned in Source C not least because Italians – 'courageous volunteers' – were prepared to fight for the cause. It is clear that Garibaldi believes unity to be a reality, even if not all approve, and that the task is to complete the 'liberation' of the state and 'with the honourable mission of regenerating Italy'.</p> <p>Source E could also be used to support the interpretation. After all, the battle for Rome was more of a skirmish and there was little resistance. Victor Emmanuel who was already king of the rest of the country is shown now holding temporal power instead of the Papacy and it could be argued that even the Pope's continued exercise of spiritual power does not detract from the fact that politically and geographically Italy was united with the inclusion of Rome. Indeed, the city assumed the status of the capital almost immediately. Further, Victor Emmanuel is shown to have military strength behind him, perhaps representative of support, whereas the Pope is a lonely figure. Standard comments about the unreliability of cartoons can be expected especially one from Punch but many will regard the cartoon as presenting a fairly helpful view of the situation.</p> <p>The alternative view is in A, and partly in B, C and E. However, Sources A and B might be paired as evidence for the reluctance of the South to unite with the North. Source A acknowledges the hostility of Neapolitans. He believes 'nobody wants us there' and they 'reject union with us'.</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>Indeed, the reference to the strength of resistance and that sixty battalions ‘seem inadequate’ emphasises the level of hostility. This could be linked to the reference in Source B to the need to apply ‘overwhelming force’ in Sicily. Details about the scale of the civil war in the south might be provided, not least that more died in it than in the wars of independence. It might be argued that opposition to the Piedmontese, which is specifically the focus of the comments in Source A, did not necessarily mean hostility to union as such but simply not on the terms of the time. Was the author’s pessimism merely typical of the condescending attitudes of northerners to the south? Do his remarks about those in the north urging universal suffrage in Naples reveal the arrogance of northerners in assuming their view of the future was best? Perhaps the author of Source B represents a similar conceit as he suggests that the Parliament in Turin is simply not active enough. Source B emphasises the importance of localism in mentioning ‘family feuds’ and the strength of the ‘underworld’. There is scope to explain the parochialism of the South, especially in Sicily, and the influence of the mafia. The nature of the terrain might be considered as a factor in explaining such parochialism and as a reason for the brigandage referred to in both with specific reference in Source B to ‘deserters who took to the hills’.</p> <p>Source C can be used to show how, geographically, the peninsula was not united before 1866. The source testifies to the mischief orchestrated by Rome as an indication of the separation of the latter from Italy. Yet, the war secured the annexation of Venice. Cross reference to Source A might be made to confirm the problem of Austria and cross reference to Source E might be made to develop the hostility of Rome in supporting brigandage especially if the point about the influence of priests in Source C is picked out. The power of the priesthood in Catholic Italy could be examined. Garibaldi considers their influence as a major reason for ‘the peasants learning to hate Italy’. The outlook of the peasantry might be attributed to their natural conservatism. The fact that Garibaldi has to appeal to ‘our women’ to stir support for the cause against Austria might be regarded as a sign of apathy at least. The cartoon may be used to argue the prospects for unity were poor if candidates interpret the Pope’s refusal to hand over the keys as signifying the continued independence of the Vatican or the reluctance of the Papacy to give its blessing to Italy or its insistence that the Church control education. The battle on the outskirts of Rome prior to the entry of Italian troops might be used to show the resistance of the Papacy to unification.</p> <p>A judgement might conclude that the evidence is weighted in favour of the interpretation which would be reasonable. However, it could be argued that the evidence suggests this was less obviously the case in the early years of the decade and more so later. Indeed, the events of 1866 might be considered a turning point in that respect.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>Both sources agree that slaves do not work hard and lack talent. Source B refers to ‘Their lack of skill and ingenuity – except in avoiding work’ and in Source C they are described as ‘indolent and unskilful’. They also converge on the point of standards of provision. In Source B the author concedes the slaves ‘needs are provided for’ and Source C claims ‘negroes are better off than free labourers’. In terms of motivation Source B suggests free labourers are motivated by ‘rewards’ unlike the slave who ‘can make no provision for old age’ and in Source C the implication is that slaves also lacked motivation as ‘The negro slave shares the profits of the farm despite his indolence’. Some candidates might see a difference on the point of motivation and argue that the latter point was itself enough to motivate the slave. Otherwise, the sources largely disagree. In looking to ‘complete his task with least labour’ a free labourer shows initiative, according to Source B, and he is more likely to use his intelligence whereas slave labour ‘is little more than brute force’. However, Source C claims ‘monotonous employment makes them (free labourers) automatons’. Similarly, Source C claims ‘free labourers work separately’ unlike slaves who work in groups. Source C also charges that in ‘free society the employer robs the employee’ whereas the implication, at least, of Source B is that employees are rewarded according to their labour. C also argues that the products of slavery, food and cotton, are more useful than the supposedly superfluous products of industry.</p> <p>Overall, despite the points of agreement it is clear that the author of Source B is critical of slavery and prefers free labour whereas the author of Source C supports slave labour and denigrates free labour. At a basic level some candidates may argue that this is because Source B was written by a Northerner and Source C by a Southerner. A more subtle comment would be to suggest the former was in a better position to judge as he had lived in Virginia at different times in the previous ten years even though he originated from New York, whereas there is no suggestion that the author of Source C had experience of the North. Further, the latter was a planter and spokesman for the slave interest with a personal investment and commitment to slave labour, whereas the author of Source B may be assumed not to be an owner of slaves as he is described as an ‘observer of slave labour’. Some candidates may argue that despite this Source C is convincing not least because the author was an academic and the author of Source B might be considered a little more idealistic – a point that could be demonstrated by reference to some of the realities of industrial work. It might be argued that the positions adopted by both authors are reflective of the increased interest in and debate about the benefits and drawbacks of both slave and free labour in the 1850s.</p> <p>In judgement, the difference between the sources may be considered to be unsurprising given their authorship. However, the hint of recognition in Source C that slaves were not hard working may commend it to some as more reliable than Source B which makes no mention of the lack of security and the ruthlessness of employment in industry. Similarly, both concede that slaves ‘needs are provided for’.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus:</u> <u>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 Sources ‘as evidence for ...’.</p> <p>The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>In support of the interpretation candidates are likely to place emphasis on Sources A, C and, to some extent, E. A counter argument can be constructed based on Sources B, D and, to some extent, C.</p> <p>The Sale of Slaves and Stock (Source A) provides evidence of the value of slaves. The prices for individual slaves in many cases are high. The fact that younger slaves are less expensive than older and skilled slaves indicates the profits that might be made by trading in slaves. In addition to this candidates could explain how slaves born on the plantation would be highly profitable and that the younger ones listed might be examples of this. The efficiency of slaves might be deduced from the range of skills attributed to those for sale indicating the relative self-sufficiency of the plantation. The value of slaves in monetary terms and their importance to the efficiency of the plantation could be stressed by the lengths to which slave owners pursued fugitive slaves. Further, since the abolition of the purchase of slaves from abroad in 1808 the value of the slave stock had risen. Candidates will assert that the auction of slaves was commonplace and the poster was typical of the period. Candidates could analyse the description in the introduction of the prices as 'low' by arguing that this is either an indication that prices were usually higher, so these prices represent value for money, or they suggest a fall in the market.</p> <p>Source C concentrates on the benefits of slavery by way of different emphasis. The productivity of slave labour is lauded as higher than that of free labour and the products of the South are stressed as more useful than those from free labour. Yet, the impression given that slaves worked harder might be contested by the admission within the source of the 'indolence' of slaves. The references to the 'region feeds and clothes a great part of mankind' may be considered an exaggeration but candidates might assess the profitability of the implied reference to sugar, rice and other food crops and cotton. The picture of a contented slave labour force working more efficiently than free labour might be examined by cross reference to other sources and the application of knowledge about the coercion needed to make slaves work. As with Source A, which lists 36 slaves owned by one planter, it might be argued that the author of Source C had, by definition of being a planter, at least 20 slaves which signalled by implication that slavery was profitable. However, given the entrenched nature of the system of slavery it was also the case that ownership of slaves was traditional rather than necessarily profitable. Allowing for the climate of the South it might be argued that slave labour was efficient because without it the land would not be cultivated. Candidates might challenge this point. Reference to Source E would be appropriate to confirm that profit could be made from slave labour by owners hiring their slaves to others. Rates of pay could be taken from the source to show this. However, in countering the interpretation Source E argues that slavery was inefficient as slave labour was 'far less valuable ... than free white labour'. This charge is based on several counts.</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>Firstly, compared to ‘energetic white men engaged in agriculture’ ‘Negro men ‘were slow and careless’. Secondly, unemployment was high in the South compared to the North where ‘employment is about 100% higher than in the slave States’. Linked to this is the ‘poverty, ignorance and superstition’ of non-slaveholding whites. Overall, the impression is that white man power is wasted and under-valued, in large measure because of slavery, whilst slave labour itself is inefficient, preferred only for snobbish reasons (the steer in the introduction). As the author is a Southerner who had researched the economy of the South it could be argued that the evidence provided is reliable. Cross reference to Source D might be made to reinforce the claims made in Source E.</p> <p>After all, Source D paints a stark contrast between North and South depicting Ohio as bountiful as a result of ‘the magic effect of free labour’ and Kentucky as ‘now left very far behind its young rival’ and ‘shows how slave labour hinders the development of wealth’. The contrast is stressed by highlighting the earlier settlement of Kentucky and ‘its superior natural advantages’. However, appearing in a journal produced by the Free Soilers it is not surprising that it champions the advantages of free labour or that it identified Ohio as a particularly good example of its virtues as the free soilers were strong in that State. Further, if Kentucky as a border state is regarded as backward then it could be argued this is a telling indictment of the effects of slavery as it would be more stifling in the Deep South. The case against the interpretation could be extended by the use of Source B. In every respect this source condemns slavery as inefficient: free labourers are regarded as more motivated, flexible and skilful to such a degree that the effect of slavery on the labour force is ‘painful to observe’. It could be argued that as a businessman the author may have first-hand experience of managing free labourers and that his stays in Virginia allowed him to make considered judgements of the benefits of the latter compared to slave labour. As mentioned above, candidates might feel that the admission in Source C that slaves were ‘indolent and unskilful’ is worth stressing given the authorship of the source.</p> <p>This point might figure prominently in the judgements of candidates. Laziness is specifically highlighted in three Sources (B, C and E) and implied in Source D. Only Source C makes any detrimental comment on free labour which might be dismissed as unconvincing from a planter. Yet, even though the evidence suggests that slavery was inefficient the sources concede that profit could be made from it (Sources A, C and E). Nonetheless, it might be argued that it was less profitable than it might have been given its inefficiency.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)	<p>The Sources are similar in content in that both agree that Western Germany was a militaristic power and link this to the recent past of Germany, with Source A referring to the revival of militarism and Source B explicitly claiming that West German policy was a direct continuation of Nazism. B goes so far as to argue that West Germany is ready to provoke a Civil War. Both also feel that West Germany is responsible for the activities of spies who have infiltrated East Germany and wrought havoc there. Both mention sabotage.</p> <p>The Sources also differ. Source A says that Western Governments are encouraging West Germany but B blames Adenauer and West Germany's Federal Republic more directly. Source A suggests that international agreements are being broken whereas Source B puts more stress on the peaceful policies of the Soviet bloc in contrast to Bonn's aggression. B considers that other states beyond East Germany are being affected. There are some differences in the sections on the activities of agents, with A focusing on disturbances brought about while B is concerned about hostile propaganda. A makes more of the emigration from East Berlin, while B just refers to enticing people. Only B makes clear what the outcome is to be.</p> <p>The provenance and context of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both are Sources from the East German/Soviet viewpoint. Both are official Sources and both issued very close to the time when the Wall was built. They thus show the immediate reaction of the Warsaw Pact countries and of the GDR government and their need to justify the building of the Wall. Not surprisingly the Warsaw Pact countries, as a military alliance, focus on the role of the Western powers in terms of 'control' of West Germany and its use as a base to extend their control eastwards, while the GDR ministers are more interested in events closer to home and what they are going to do about problems. But they need to maintain the support of the Soviet bloc and so include the wider impact of West German actions in their account. Neither are especially reliable to the real situation in Germany – unresolved issues of reunification and especially the loss of skilled personnel to the West, although the hint of this in B may lead candidates to consider it the more reliable of the two sources in the unwitting evidence it provides.</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.....'</p> <p>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 judgements 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 outside forces were at work is contained in Sources A, C and E with some references in B. The opposing view, that the pressure was from within East Germany but also from West Germany is most clear in Source D, but has some support in other Sources.</p> <p>The supporting argument is found in Sources A, the Warsaw Pact statement, Source C, Adenauer's response and in Source E, the modern journalist's judgement. Source B, the GDR government statement contains references to this view. Source A argues that it is the attitudes of the western powers that have made it necessary for East Germany to act and refers to international treaties which have been broken. In Source C Adenauer takes a completely different line in blaming the rest of the Eastern bloc who feared instability in East Germany might spread eastwards. Source B, from the GDR ministers, supports this argument, even if from a rather different standpoint. Source E shows that both Khrushchev and Kennedy were alarmed at the developing situation and both stepped up their armed forces. E tends to blame Khrushchev more, for bringing up the issue of sovereignty for East Germany, to which the West would never agree voluntarily despite its original actions in creating the Federal Republic. The suggestion here is that the Great Powers had never satisfactorily resolved the 'German question'. Kennedy remained committed to not recognising a permanent division.</p> <p>The opposing argument in Source D, the contemporary American view, is that the issue was an East German one and that East Germany could no longer tolerate the loss of economically valuable young professionals in such large numbers, or the activities of foreign agencies in East Berlin. Source A supports the point about spies and Source B mentions subversion, thus indicating that these Sources do show some appreciation of the problems in East Germany. Source C puts the issue in a world-wide context but backs up the references in Source D to the escape of many East Germans and stresses the desire for German unity and brotherhood. Source E also refers to the flood of emigration from East Germany.</p> <p>The provenance and context of the Sources should be integrated into the discussion. The Sources take the view that would be expected from their provenance. Sources A and B are eager to justify the building of the Wall, one from the viewpoint of the wider Warsaw Pact and one more from the East German context. The implication in other Sources that the Eastern bloc saw West Berlin as a serious threat which might impinge on their stability shows the Soviet view. Sources C and D both have a balanced view, Adenauer wants to blame the Communists, but also bolster up his own regime. Candidates may be aware that he was campaigning for the upcoming federal elections when</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.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>the Wall was built and his initial reaction was criticised as late and muted. Source D may be seen as quite surprising as the American historian, writing very close to the events, is relatively sympathetic to the dilemma of the East Germans and sees their actions as more or less inevitable. Source E, a more considered judgement, shows that the Cold War context was an essential part of the issue, and that Khrushchev's action in cancelling cuts as a diplomatic play in his negotiation with the West may have precipitated the flood of refugees and hence the Wall. Neither party could afford to lose face in negotiations so the Wall was the Russian solution.</p> <p>Candidates may well conclude that the issue of Berlin had been largely an international one since 1945 so this was likely to continue. The intervention of JFK made the Wall part of the ongoing Cold War. But for the East German government, despite the pressure from without, this was a German problem to be solved within Germany. Some may argue that neither view is mutually exclusive. Pressures occurred from both within the two Germanys and from their superpower supporters.</p>		<p>No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (a)	<p>Candidates should focus clearly on US involvement in China between 1945 and 1950. The contents of the Sources have some similarities, though with subtle differences. They agree that US support for Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists failed to defeat the CCP. They agree on US military support for Chiang, but while Source D suggests an aggressive forward policy of aiding Chiang to 'bomb mainland China', Source C mentions only 'military advisers'. They agree on the Chinese people's perception that independence would be won only by the CCP. In Source C, Acheson blames the CCP portraying themselves as 'guardians and liberators of the people' in their propaganda. Source D might be seen to exemplify that propaganda. Implicitly, Acheson admits that the US 'backed the wrong horse' in supporting Chiang, whose corrupt regime did not have faith in itself. Source D agrees that Chiang was a US puppet, similar to others in South Korea and Vietnam.</p> <p>The Sources have distinct differences in content. Source D sees US policy as imperialist, 'attempting to annex China', 'denying the Chinese people any opportunity to live in independence and peace'. US policy failure is due to the Chinese national feeling. Source C, on the other hand, suggests that the US did not interfere, far from D's claim of encouraging Chiang to 'bomb mainland China'. Acheson states that incompetent Nationalist leadership of government and army caused US containment policy to fail. Acheson's purpose in C is to shift the blame away from Truman's administration onto Chiang's incompetent regime, together with fanatical and ruthless Communist propaganda. Whereas Chou En-lai in D stresses the CCP's victory as anti-imperialist nationalism, Acheson in C stresses Communist lies and the contrasting level of morale of the forces of the two sides. Acheson gives no ideological defence and fails to mention Taiwan, unlike Chou En-lai.</p> <p>Such differences may be explained by their provenance. The author of Source D is Chou En-lai, the Chinese Premier and Foreign Secretary, a close ally of Mao in consolidating the CCP's victory. Typically, he will adopt an anti-American stance when interviewed by the Chinese press in Beijing just 3 months after the victorious declaration of the PRC, as it is an obvious propaganda opportunity. His view is that the US were heavily involved. Chinese victory was at US expense, whereas C argues the failure was of Nationalist China, not the US. Likewise, Source C might be seen as unreliable, as Acheson, Secretary of State at the time, records his version of events in memoirs 20 years later. Some might use McCarthyite criticisms mentioned in C's steer, to evaluate Acheson's justification of weak policy many years after US right-wing anti-Communist exposés had died down. However, discrete off-loading of knowledge on Joseph McCarthy would undermine source comparison.</p> <p>The context of the sources is different, Source D at a tense time in the Cold War shortly after the USSR, now an atomic power, had made an alliance with the PRC. Source C is written at a time when Nixon was seeking détente with China and withdrawal from Vietnam, so may have a view distorted by</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 ...'.</p> <p>The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	changes in Cold War attitudes, although its purpose of self-justification is clear. Both have this element and so their evidence is flawed, although knowledge might stress the veracity of D's confidence and C's awareness of Nationalist incompetence.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The best answers may discriminate between US policy towards 'mainland Asia' and the islands of the Pacific rim, but this is not expected for the highest levels of the mark scheme. The Sources argue in support of and against the argument, so they may be grouped accordingly. The positive argument that the USA did little to contain the spread of Communism is in Sources A and B and to some extent in C (just 'military observers' and 'aid'). A negative argument that the US provided adequate support for Chiang Kai-shek during the Chinese Civil War appears in Sources C and D which suggest that it was Chiang's lack of support that caused him to fail. However, the main counter-argument rests on Source E where Truman changes US policy towards a 'hot' war to protect South Korea. It may be known that mainland Asia was more difficult to protect than Japan and the islands of the Pacific rim (by the defensive perimeter strategy) and that Indochina was a French dilemma during this pre-1950 period.</p> <p>The interpretation in the question, that the USA did little to protect Asia from the spread of Communism, is in Sources A and B, which work well together. Rhee, in Source A suggests the USA caused the grave threat faced by Korea by dividing it into North and South in connivance with the USSR in 1945. The JCS confirm this in Source B, by agreeing that the 38th parallel is under threat, though they are unwilling to provide the necessary protection, for fear of involvement in a major war. They plan to withdraw US troops from South Korea within 3 days of the writing of Source B. In Source A, Rhee 'expects the USA to 'stand by' Korea in line with the Truman Doctrine, but Source B suggests that this is not appropriate as the effort required would be enormous and the expense 'far out of proportion to the likely benefits'. An explanation of the significance of the Truman Doctrine for the question might be based on relevant knowledge of the principles of containment and Marshall Aid applied to Europe, but should not open the door to a tangential essay. Knowledge of the different benefits expected in Asia compared to Europe (with its democratic tradition and comparative proximity to Moscow) might inform an evaluation of the relative benefits of aiding Korea and eg Greece. This might also explain the comments in Source B, 'heavy international obligations' and Source A Rhee's request for 'a pact similar to NATO'. Knowledge might inform evaluation of the practicality of a pact or mutual defence agreement 'with other nations'. Asia had been devastated by Japanese occupation during the war, yet the USA had led the reconstruction of Japan. It might possibly be known that SEATO was formed only in 1954 and was weak. An interim judgement might be reached on whether Rhee's suggestions in Source A were feasible, and his motive in attempting to spring the US into a military commitment to the South, although Source B is likely to be taken as US abandonment of the duty expected by Rhee, thus supporting the interpretation.</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>In contrast, Sources C, D and E support the counter-argument that US action was adequate or indeed overly forceful in D. Both suggest that the USA aided Chinese Nationalists during and after the Chinese Civil War. In Source C Acheson recalls that the USA gave Chiang Kai-shek ‘adequate aid’ during the Chinese Civil War and ‘aircraft to bomb mainland China’ (D) from the island of Formosa (Taiwan) after Chiang had fled there. This aid was not adequate to secure him victory because of his own shortcomings. Knowledge may be used to evaluate US aid for the Nationalists in the light of US views on Mao and the CCP.</p> <p>Provenance might be linked and used in evaluation. The nature and purpose of Source C, as Acheson’s memoirs countering McCarthyite criticisms at the time, make them as unreliable as Chou En-lai’s anti-imperialist propaganda in Source D. The tone and hindsight of Source C might be commented upon: ‘history has proved time and time again’ justifying Acheson’s weak policy leading to the fall of China. Chou, in D, claims that the USA directed Chiang’s actions for its own imperialist ambitions while Acheson in C sees Chiang to blame for failure. Source C’s publication date is long after McCarthy’s views had been discredited and coincides with Nixon’s discussion of détente with Mao. 1969 saw public protests and US withdrawal from Vietnam. Hence Acheson’s memoirs might seem more persuasive to a 1969 audience. The tone of Chou in Source D, by singling out Acheson and linking him to US imperialism, smacks of propaganda to consolidate CCP victory at the height of the Cold War. Its context is a Sino-Soviet aid agreement signed the previous month. Source D claims US policy is itself aggressive rather than defensive, ‘interference’ in Asian people’s affairs and the use of puppet rulers also in Korea and Vietnam. Mention of Rhee in D might lead to relevant cross-reference with ‘benefits for the USA’ in B and the authorship and tone of A. Knowledge of Bao Dai in Vietnam is not expected, but hints of relevant evidence should be rewarded, eg US support for the French-backed puppet against Ho Chi Minh. An interim judgement might be reached on the comparative value of these linked sources. The provenance might suggest the question’s assertion be accepted.</p> <p>However, Source E is central to the counter-argument that the USA took forceful action, as Truman is taking firm action to protect Korea, albeit too late. The content he mentions in Source E is a Soviet-backed invasion of South Korea by North Korea, feared by Rhee in Source A. In light of World War II, he fears meriting the humiliating reputation of ‘appeaser’. Knowledge of a failed League of Nations might be linked to his emphasis on defence of the United Nations to divert blame for the loss of China by his administration. The view in Source E reflects Truman’s change of policy marked by NSC68. It may be known that the USSR had nuclear weapons after August 1949, increasing Cold War tensions. An image of nobly supporting the UN might also counter criticisms that Korea remained divided.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>In evaluating the interpretation in the question, it might be suggested that Truman aimed to protect the UN rather than Asia at this stage. Source E is published in context of the acceptance of domino theory and military escalation in Vietnam, possibly making his actions more acceptable to his readers.</p> <p>The late publication dates of Sources C and E and the rhetoric and nature of Source D might suggest that this group of sources is less useful or reliable than Sources A and B. Grouping and evaluation should be assessed by examiners according to quality of argument.</p> <p>Thus, some might judge the set of sources as supporting the interpretation by stressing that Asia was a low priority for the USA in this period. Others might argue alternative views, such as emphasis on the need for caution by the USA to avoid direct confrontation with the USSR or China and that much was done in this period. However, 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 2013

