

GCE

History A

Unit **F963/02**: Option A Modern 1815-1945

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2014

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 2014

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

Annotation	Meaning
BP	Blank Page – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
C	In Q(a) a comparison of source similarity or difference is made, either of content or of provenance .In Q(b) it denotes an effective grouping (for two or more interpretations), linkage or cross reference between sources.
J	In Q(a) a judgement is reached on the sources <i>as evidence</i> using content and provenance. In Q(b) a judgement is made on how far the <i>sources</i> support an interpretation.
P	In Q(a) the provenance is discussed and used as part of the judgement. In Q(b) a source’s provenance is discussed discretely and not used to evaluate for the question. Linkage to the question is implicit.
S	In Q(a) a source or both sources are discussed separately and sequentially thus preventing comparison. In Q(b) the sources are approached sequentially thus preventing linkage and cross reference for the argument.
XP	Points of content and argument are juxtaposed – they are not comparable in Q(a) or the linkage made is inappropriate in Q(b) .
F	In either question the approach to a source, the sources as a whole, or the response in general, is overly formulaic or generic, failing to engage with either source content or precise provenance and context.
KU	Knowledge is used appropriately to support, extend, explain (context) or question a source or sources.
K	Knowledge is ‘bolt-on’, there for its own sake and not used or linked to the sources.
EVAL	There is evaluation of the sources for the key issue and question. This can be used for Q(a) but is more likely to be used for Q(b) .
ILL	The sources are simply used for reference or to illustrate an argument in Q(b) .
NAQ	The points made are not linked to the question and do not answer it.
?	This is to be used in both questions where is a factual error, irrelevant material and, in Q(b) , an inaccurate, questionable or unconvincing grouping of the sources for the question. It is also to be used in both questions where a judgement is on the topic rather than the sources.
NAR	There is description, either of the sources or of knowledge, or simply a narrative.
SEEN	The page has been read. This must be used on each page seen to ensure that the whole response has been considered.

NB. A brief summative comment is required following both questions. Use the language of the generic mark scheme to justify the level you have awarded. For specific guidance please refer to the topic specific mark scheme. Marks awarded must match the comments given.

Subject-specific Marking Instructions

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

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)

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
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>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
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>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
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**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	AO1a 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	AO1a 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	AO1a 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>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)	<p>The context is the Great Reform Act, a measure long pursued and desired by Radicals, with much popular unrest during its prolonged passage in 1831-2. Both agree that the Act is harmful to the radical cause. Hetherington in A considers it a measure to keep the people down whilst Hunt in B thinks the people have been rendered outlaws because of their lack of property. They are released from any obligation to defer to an illegitimate parliament. Both see the Act as a defeat for radicalism. Both are confident that it will fail – the ‘rising spirit of democracy’ in ‘A’; the ‘we say/we will’ in ‘B’.</p> <p>The differences are that Hetherington in ‘A’ focuses on government motives, arguing that they had intended such an outcome all along. It was an anti-radical measure designed to split the middle classes from any dalliance with radicals and align them firmly with the landowning aristocracy to preserve the old system. It is about ‘self-preservation’, ‘power and office’. Hunt in ‘B’ looks to the future arguing that it will force the people to take responsibility for their own fate, especially on wages and hours. He looks forward to popular activism on a range of issues now that access to parliament was denied the people (and was to be vindicated in this view). They can no longer look to parliament, political parties or the middle classes but only to themselves.</p> <p>The provenance is that both are from prominent radicals, one a journalist and activist involved in the free press campaigns (Hetherington in A), the other an older radical, veteran of the 1810s and 1820s (Hunt in B). One is immediately after the Act has been passed and reflects disappointment after the radical hopes of 1830-31. The other comes several years later (1835) when factory and poor law reform in 1833 and 1834 have coloured the debate on how to react. Hunt was at the end of his life, commenting on the eve of forming the Charter that Hetherington was involved in. The tone in both is angry but whilst Hetherington in A is outraged that the measure can be seen as ‘great’ and uses the term with irony adding more class hatred by contrasting a ‘feudal aristocracy’, their lackey ‘yeoman landowners’ and now new allies, the ‘shopocracy’ of the newly enfranchised towns with the noble ‘people’, Hunt in B is more calculating and logical in approach (either an equal share in making laws is granted without delay or higher wages and shorter hours need to be conceded without argument). Hetherington in A is writing in his campaigning newspaper, anxious to imprint his view on his radical readership. Hunt in B is commenting, after a long career as radical leader, on what he sees as the logic of the situation but particularly from the perspective of much radical activism on individual issues following 1832. It reads like a ‘I told you so’.</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.....’</p> <p>The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>In terms of judgement both are useful for radical views, one for the analysis of Whig intent and of the strategy behind the Act (from a very slanted perspective), the other from a vantage of greater hindsight on the strategy to be adopted by radicalism post the Reform Act – would it be another campaign to gain an equal share in law making (Chartism) or taking issues into their own hands on individual issues such as the 10 Hour movement?</p>		
(b)	<p>The argument that the origins of Chartism were political can be found in Sources A, B and in one reading of D. They stress the ongoing radical campaign for parliamentary reform which was the very essence of the Chartist movement and central to the Charter's 6 points, every one of which was political and constitutional, A and B stressing the negative reaction to the reform Act of 1832 as the background and stimulant to a wholly working-class body that would campaign simply for universal suffrage and a wider remodelling of the political system. Hetherington in A was one of the authors of the Charter. His analysis of '1832' is a political and class one – the oligarchic Whigs needed to attract new urban property to strengthen their hold over the political system. The middle classes were to be included to prevent them joining with the other victims of aristocratic monopoly, the labouring and working classes. Although he talks in economic class terms Hetherington in A also has a strongly political analysis of a situation which will lead six years later to the Charter – strength will come in numbers and in the concession of universal suffrage. Hunt in B is, similarly, entirely political, talking of the continued unenfranchised as 'political slaves'. Although mentioning economic reform and action it is subservient to political action and is a consequence of neglecting a proper representation in parliament. He merely seeks to use poor law and factory reform for political ends. Both he and Hetherington take a strongly political line and, as the key representatives of radical leadership in the first 40 years of the century, their evidence is telling. They set the tone and the nature of radical political discourse. Stephens in D also contains traditional references to political liberty – free air, security, although its context and language is economic, religious and social. He stresses the importance of political 'universal suffrage'. As radical leaders all three may be considered effective evidence for the political origins of Chartism.</p> <p>The alternative, that economic and social issues saw the origins of Chartism, can be found in Sources C, D and E and in another reading of Source B. Candidates may note the references in A and especially B to hours, wages, class and economic</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a 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, including 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> <p>The sources can be read / analysed in different ways and as part of their judgement candidates will need to appreciate this.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>circumstances (seen here as secondary to political issues but clearly important considerations). Source C stresses the importance of the New Poor Law and the popular reaction to it ('souring the hearts of the labouring population'), although the provenance of Kydd and his association with Oastler would perhaps align him too much with Factory, Poor Law and other 'paternal', social and economic issues rather than the straightforwardly political. To Kydd the New Poor Law and the Anti-Poor Law League (which he does not mention) are what has really aroused class hatred and fed into Chartism. Writing in 1838, the year of the 'Charter', his evidence of the strength of social feeling generated by opposition to such class legislation as the New Poor Law, could be considered convincing. He became an active Chartist (lecturer and barrister). Stephens in D makes the classic statement about Chartism being a social and economic question – 'knife and fork' - although his audience may condition this response. He stresses clothing, food, housing and work as the crucial recruiter and is publically saying this to his audience on the Manchester moors. There is also an indirect reference to the New Poor Law in the security of family, wife and children (notoriously separated in the new Workhouses) to which he appeals. As a Methodist minister he might be expected to take this slant, stressing the moral affront to God. He is seeking to appeal to a distressed audience and candidates might stress talking of deprivation rather than abstract political reform from a previous era is to be expected Pilling in E also stresses economic origins – wages and a Ten Hours question, as befits an active local campaigner in South Lancashire, badly hit by the Great Victorian depression of the late 1830s and early 1840s. However as a power loom weaver, hit by technological change, Pilling is likely to stress economic and social pressures, especially as he is defending himself in the trials following the Plug Plot riots. He is a trade union activist whose concern is the downward spiral of wages. His view is that all wealth comes from the working man so that master, cottage owner and publican all depend on his work and wages – an early version of a high wage economy that spends to the good of all. This is undoubtedly an economic vision of Chartism rather than a political one. Candidates may use contextual knowledge on the great Victorian depression which affected Chartism and may have acted as the key recruiting sergeant as well as affecting how leaders like Pilling framed their appeals. Nonetheless candidates may spot that he mentions 'others' take a different view, presumably political or one based on religion and God's laws (the Methodism of Stephens in D). Nonetheless for him it was 'wages' and 'hours'. It was the source of his activism and in 1843, with the Depression still at its worst, candidates may deem his motivation more typical. Hunt in Source B also stresses the need to take economic action over wages and work, although its overall</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>context remains a political one. Candidates may decide that the evidence of C, D and E is more convincing given that these sources were from more ordinary Chartists, albeit active ones. Kydd and Pilling, despite active involvement locally and some leadership roles were of humble origin, the former a Glasgow shoemaker, the latter a power loom weaver. Stephens in D, as a Methodist minister, is also close to his labouring flock and knows how to motivate them in his sermons which are easily transferred to radical outdoor meetings like Kersal Moor (Methodism’s origins were out of doors). They may speak more effectively for the rank and file of Chartism in contrast to the traditional and prominent radical leaders of pre and early Chartism like Hetherington and Hunt in A and B whose stress is on the tradition of 18th century political enlightenment and its struggle during and after the French revolution. That had been their background and experience rather than Trade Union activism and the struggle against the Poor Law.</p> <p>No set judgement is expected. Candidates could either stress the evidence of lesser Chartists on the economic and social origins of the movement like the poor law and factory issues or make more of the importance of the older leadership in keeping the debate firmly political. The Charter was, after all, exclusively political in its demands, albeit with economic and social transformation as a rationale for their political demands.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>The context for both sources is, on his personal initiative, the controversial purchase of the Suez Canal shares by Disraeli using Rothschild loans to plug the gap until Parliament could approve the not inconsiderable finance involved. It enabled Britain to move more quickly than either the Russians or the French but laid him open to the charge that he was bouncing the nation into retrospective approval of his actions, hence the debate in the two sources.</p> <p>Both sources stress the main matters in dispute – that shares had been purchased and no votes in the affairs of the Canal Company were attached to this ownership. Both stress that this was a popular move with the press and public. Lowe in Source A acknowledges this – ‘purchase makes the government popular’ and Disraeli in Source B makes much of it as a means of ‘strengthening the Empire’ which the ‘country wanted’. Both see the imperial vision as a key issue and both agree that Gladstone would not have done it, Lowe in A on grounds of fiscal probity, Disraeli in B on grounds of imperial neglect. However there are considerable differences which outweigh the similarities especially given the political controversies generated and by the nature of the authors – the main protagonist Disraeli and a rigorous Liberal and former Chancellor, Robert Lowe. They differ in their approach to the issue of whether the British government had in fact gained much practical control over the canal. Lowe in A argues that shares without votes were effectively useless and would not prevent a future French or Russian monopoly. He accuses the government of not understanding the issues and rushing into an ill-considered purchase. Although Disraeli refers to Lowe’s points he does not specifically refute them. Instead he changes the goalposts by claiming the purchase was more about a wider imperial vision (much safer ground) that would secure the key imperial highway to India and the Far East. He fails to answer the specifics of Lowe’s accusations by denying that it was intended as a ‘financial investment’. It is on this vision that the real differences lie. Lowe in A, whilst agreeing with Disraeli that the purchase was seen as a ‘spirited’ imperial policy, considers it spurious, expensive and more about misleading the public, gaining votes and selling newspapers. His point is that expectations had been so aroused that the government had to deny they wished to make Egypt a British Protectorate (presumably to assuage Ottoman fears). In other words it was a strategy that blew up in their faces and was ‘incomprehensible’. Disraeli confirms that the purchase was a ‘political transaction’ but stresses the canal was not to be the basis for a future Egyptian Empire, as Lowe alleges, but simply the means of securing the route to India and the Far East. Candidates may also note that that there is no mention of the Rothschild Bank in</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 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
	<p>Source A, Disraeli's reference to it in Source B being a retort to another criticism in the debate (that the government should not have contacts with private banks).</p> <p>As regards provenance the key is that Disraeli's points are clearly a response to Lowe and others. His points are self-justificatory, designed to bamboozle the House of Commons Committee scrutinising the purchase. He is aware he has to seek retrospective approval for the purchase given the cost involved but is confident his action is popular. He plays on the implication that the previous Gladstone government was prone to the accusation of imperial inaction and pusillanimity. He avoids the financial detail and sticks to the general and patriotic point that he was acting to strengthen the Empire. This will be reported in the press, something Lowe was all too well aware of. Disraeli's tone was grandiloquent and statesmanlike – 'the highway to our Indian Empire' – typically Disraelian. In contrast Lowe, a rather battered Gladstonian former Chancellor, was usually a details man – his points are in part narrowly fiscal, but he also makes the wider point about the politics of Disraeli's manoeuvre which he is keen to expose. His is a very liberal critique of Disraeli.</p> <p>In terms of judgement candidates may consider both to be of equal value. Together they provide the two sides of the argument and agree on enough (the imperial aspects) to demonstrate the importance of the purchase both politically and in terms of future imperial developments. Some may prefer Lowe's penetrating critique (fiscal, political and imperial) as more perceptive on the reasons for purchase but as evidence for Disraeli's views Source B is typical and candidates may consider him to be right, Lowe's points seeming petty and nit-picking.</p>		
(b)	<p>The focus of the question is whether Disraeli's imperial policy was decisive, strong and forward looking, establishing key British communication interests in Egypt, securing the northern frontiers of the Indian Empire against Russian penetration and was innovative and expansionary in Southern Africa or whether, as the question suggests, it was in fact a weak and uncertain policy, reactive to events and creating more trouble than it solved. The view that it was a strong policy is to be found in Sources B and E, with elements of C and D. The assertion of weakness in the question is to be found in Source A and parts of C and D.</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</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Three of the sources are from the key ‘imperial’ figure, Disraeli, in rather different circumstances. In Source B he is publicly justifying one of his more famous and flamboyant actions, the purchase of the Suez Canal shares, whilst in Sources C and D he is commenting privately on Indian policy towards Afghanistan and Russia to his new India Secretary, Gathorne Hardy, recently created 1st Earl of Cranbrook, (Source C) where one can expect some honesty (and exasperation) and in Source D to the Queen where he was prone to exaggerate, amuse but also inform. The latter is in part reportage, providing in this case a key insight to policy discussion and formation. Taken together they provide mixed evidence on the question, C and D especially can be viewed in two ways. The other two sources, A and E are from a prominent liberal critic (Source A), aware of the politics of imperialism, and Source E from Disraeli’s Colonial Secretary, a key post, (Hicks Beach replaced Viscount Cranbourne in 1878 when the latter resigned over the Eastern Question). The date of E is of particular importance - during an unsanctioned British invasion of Zululand by Frere in January 1879 following a provocative ultimatum to Cetawayo of which Hicks Beach had just become aware. His comments can be seen in the light of ensuing events (a defeat at Isandlwana at the hands of Cetawayo and bloody conflict before an unsatisfactory victory which saw the abandonment of Frere’s Confederation schemes and dismemberment of Zululand into dependent tribal groupings that were inherently unstable). Events did not bear out Hicks Beach’s confidence which candidates may see as misplaced given his earlier warnings to Frere and Lord Chelmsford not to provoke a Zulu War at a time of crisis in the Eastern Question and in Afghanistan and India.</p> <p>The view in the question, that Disraeli’s policy was weak in Egypt, Afghanistan and Southern Africa, can be found in Source A, in parts of C and D and in a contextual awareness of E. In Source A the liberal Lowe criticises Disraeli for a weak policy that was doubly negligent. On the one hand supposed to make the government ‘popular’ by adopting a forward and ‘spirited’ policy which press and public took to be the beginnings of an Egyptian protectorate, on the other hand Lowe points to ill thought through expense, affording Britain nothing (no controlling votes in the Canal Company). It was a reaction to events – the sudden sale of the Khedive’s shares occasioned by his extravagance and impending bankruptcy – that led to ‘incomprehensible’ conduct. Although the government did repudiate ideas of a future protectorate, candidates could argue that this owed more to a concern not to alienate the Ottomans, as Disraeli in Source B stresses that his intent was to obtain a hold there to secure the ‘highway to India’. Candidates could either agree</p>		<p>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>with Lowe, stressing later events in Egypt where governments reacted rather inconsistently to events and Disraelian ‘negligence’ and over dramatisation of the extent of his success or consider his comments to be sour grapes. However, his views are partly supported by evidence in other imperial spheres in Sources C and D. In Source C Disraeli is clearly exasperated at government policy being led in effect by an over-active Viceroy of India. Lytton had been an unwise appointment of Disraeli’s and had been inadequately briefed and supervised from London. He clearly acted on his own initiative, ignoring more careful moves by Disraeli and the new Foreign Secretary Lord Salisbury to square the Russians and limit their feared diplomatic penetration of Afghanistan. His actions led to the need to avenge the humiliating rebuff with which the Amir responded to Lytton’s pressure and the ensuing debacle is discussed by the Cabinet a month later in Source D. Candidates could consider both sources to be effective evidence for a weak response to events on the spot. There is clear Cabinet division over what to do. The India Secretary Cranbrook, perhaps unsurprisingly, backed his Viceroy Lytton over military action, which in turn was opposed by the Foreign Secretary Salisbury and the Lord Chancellor Cairns, on the grounds that the Amir had been reluctant to receive either foreign power. Salisbury was right that Lytton wanted a ‘strong’ Afghan policy based on insisting the Amir receive a British Mission in Kabul to warn off the Russians and was also right that it would lead to disaster. Disraeli’s suggestion of token force (‘occupy a valley’; such action not intended to be hostile) was rejected by his India Secretary as ‘timid half measures’. A military response was eventually agreed upon. Candidates can use their own knowledge to suggest either that the first phase of the ensuing 2nd Afghan war was successful (the Amir giving in and accepting a British mission and limits on his foreign policy) or that it all went pear-shaped when that mission was slaughtered, the war continuing until 1880 in the full glare of Gladstonian anti-war publicity. Candidates could compare this with the evidence of Source E using contextual knowledge – Hicks Beach is writing to Disraeli in early 1879 trying to put a positive gloss on a de facto war both he and the PM had warned against, and indeed forbidden, at the end of 1878. At that stage events in Afghanistan appeared to be going Britain’s way – Sher Ali, faced with a British force, had accepted a British mission – and the hope was that Cetawayo would respond to similar pressure and be neutralised as a threat to Natal. Candidates may know that Frere’s (and Hicks Beach’s) confidence was misplaced- the Zulus united and the Boers later ‘moved’. Disraeli’s policy had failed and he and the Colonial Secretary could only watch helplessly.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The alternative view is to be found in Sources B and E and in a different twist of C and D. The firm statement of Disraelian policy in Source B confidently continues earlier themes in condemning the alleged negligence of Liberalism over the Empire and asserting a policy of popular imperial expansion in North Eastern Africa. He asserts the need to have a voice in the management of the key route to India. Candidates could stress this as the key imperial interest for almost a century and was rightly perceived as such by Disraeli. His action in seizing the initiative and obtaining a key asset was far from weak. However, he is justifying a policy under attack by a technical Committee and was prone to exaggeration and grandiloquence. In Source C it could be argued that, at least in public, a firm response was being taken by the Viceroy to Russia and the Amir, albeit one that ultimately failed to deliver without a damaging war and the selection of unsuitable alternatives to Sher Ali. In Source D there is evidence of a strong and active decision ('military preparations') after an argument that was perfectly appropriate for a British Cabinet to have, although Lytton was determined on such action anyway and it was in line with Disraeli's rhetoric and postures on Empire (Source B). Both sources are 'behind the scenes' and private. Honest opinion as to what to do should not detract from the adoption of a firm and commanding policy. Source E is from a new Colonial Secretary but continues the line adopted by Carnarvon on the application of federation to southern Africa (Carnarvon having established it in Canada earlier). This was a forward policy to unite the four British territories with the two Boer Republics and Zululand. The Transvaal had been annexed in 1877. Despite earlier reservations Hicks Beach now supports the Zulu War and thinks the situation on the ground conducive to a successful conclusion to British consolidation in southern Africa. He is confident that the Zulus will be easily beaten and the Boers will not take advantage. Candidates can either accept this as a reasonable conclusion to draw in January 1879 and stress a positive and forceful African policy or use their knowledge of events before and after January to argue for weak imperial policy. Candidates may conclude that the sources stress a strong policy given their Conservative and governmental provenance (except for Lowe in 'A') but knowledge and the private fears and divisions of Sources C and D may suggest a weak, reactive policy. No set conclusion is expected.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>Both sources convey a sense of hostility that was shared by most members of the House of Lords. However, there are differences of emphasis. Both authors are concerned to preserve the power of the House of Lords. C argues that ‘we have no right to jeopardise these powers’ in any way whilst D warns against doing anything ‘which cannot but serve the purpose of destroying its power for good’. Both view reform as a threat to tradition. C refers to ‘the experience of ages’ and their Lordships’ position ‘conferred on you by Providence’ as well as the importance of passing these powers ‘intact to future generations’. This sense of obligation is evident in D which refers to ‘a duty to prevent the degradation of this House’.</p> <p>The sources differ. C appears reluctant to compromise claiming it was ‘necessary to preserve these things’ (claiming to represent education, intelligence, property and wealth). However, C explains this in rather less selfish terms claiming ‘the powers of this House are essential to the liberties of the people’ and ‘a necessary safeguard against legislation that would threaten such liberties’. In contrast, D actually advocates acceptance of the Bill suggesting rejection would do no good. This is explained as a practical consideration in light of the Lords having been defeated twice already – a reference to the Budget and first Parliament Bill – and that ‘the creation of Peers would be ridiculous’ and dilute the purpose they agree upon. This is clearly for more overtly selfish reasons as ‘the introduction of Peers would mean the degradation of this House’: the new appointments would be Liberals.</p> <p>In evaluating the sources candidates may explain the reluctance of both the Duke and the Lord to accept new peers as typical of men whose titles were hereditary and who preferred to protect that privilege. The differences between them reflect the tactical division within the House of Lords about the strategy they should adopt. Candidates should interpret C as an example of the ‘Last Ditchers’ – the ‘die-hards’ who refused to concede to any reform – and D as reflecting the views of the ‘Hedgers’ – those who were prepared to accept the Bill, aware of the long term consequences of newly appointed Liberal peers whose influence would weaken the position of the Tories in the Lords permanently. Better to live to fight and resist further Liberal legislation further down the line. The dates on which these speeches were made are also relevant. Northumberland was speaking when the second Parliament Bill was before the House of Commons (it entered the Lords in June) when ‘die-hards’ still hoped its passage might be thwarted and C could be seen as an attempt to influence opinion. On the other hand, D was delivered during the debate in the Lords itself and at a point when the King had made it clear that he</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 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
	<p>would appoint new peers to secure the Bill was carried.</p> <p>In judgement candidates might argue that as the Bill was carried by only 14 votes the sources adequately reflect the division of opinion in the Lords and that, as such, A and D are both reliable and useful as evidence for the Tory response to plans to reform the Lords. Others may prefer Curzon in D on the grounds that he was an active politician, administrator and aristocrat (and former Viceroy of India), whilst Northumberland represented only the ancient nobility of the North.</p>		
(b)	<p>Evidence to support the interpretation can be found in A, B and C. A suggests that reform was a matter of principle as the House of Lords was inherently full of ‘weaknesses’. Its responses to ‘changes’ is described as irrational, it lacks initiative in ‘confronting difficult problems’ and it lacks ‘leaders’. In sum, it was sterile and outdated and there was no alternative but reform. Candidates may evaluate A as typical of a Liberal MP who was angry with the Lords for rejecting the Budget which he helped shape and to dismiss any sense of revenge on the Lords he and the Cabinet may have harboured. Nonetheless, at a time when the Lords was ridiculed as ‘Mr Balfour’s poodle’, admittedly by Lloyd George, and as it had not been reformed for generations, candidates might argue that there was some truth in the view expressed in A. B might be linked to A in so far as it refers to the Lords supporting the Commons ‘when the Tory Party is in power’ but taking control ‘when the Liberal Party is in power’. Again, Asquith was describing the situation as he saw it but candidates might argue that the implication of his remarks was that reform was a matter of principle. Alternatively it could be seen as politically motivated. He claims ‘the House of Lords is a purely partisan Chamber’ and raised ‘the real question’ of whether this was appropriate. Finally, it might be said that C reveals ‘class hatred’ as a reason for reform. The Duke believes that the Lords ‘represent education, intelligence, property and wealth’ which ‘all democracies attack and aim to annihilate’. In the years prior to this speech Lloyd George attacked the privileged, the Liberals addressed social ills and the Labour Party demanded the redistribution of wealth so the views expressed in C were, perhaps, unsurprising. Northumberland in C sees the Liberals as motivated by the principle of class and by a drive against landed property, embraced by both Old and New Liberals.</p> <p>Alternatively, it might be claimed that reform was undertaken in order to secure the legislative programme of the Liberals. B, D and E, and to some extent C, can be used in this way. B says ‘the Second Chamber has frustrated our efforts to legislate on many measures’ and the earlier reference to the Finance Bill could be used as an example of</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>the struggle the Liberals had with the Lords on Lloyd George's budget. Candidates may add knowledge about how various Liberal plans such as the Education Bill and the Licensing Bill had been thwarted by the Lords. Nonconformist issues especially were prone to savaging in the Lords on the grounds of partisan Liberal legislation. In the circumstances it was not surprising that the Prime Minister was prepared to consider reform of the Lords. In this way the reliability of B might be assessed. E also refers to a specific piece of legislation arguing that 'the Parliament Bill was carried in order that the government might be able to force through Parliament its Irish Home Rule proposals'. Again, context suggests this was a fair assumption for Bonar Law to make as the Lords had resisted previous Home Rule proposals in 1886 and 1893 and that Tories in the Lords were opposed to any change to the Union. It was certainly the case that Home Rule proposals were not at the centre of the elections of 1910, which explains the remark that they 'were hidden from the people'. At the time of his speech the issue had become central. D admits that the Lords 'had stood out twice against His Majesty's Government' over the Budget and the Parliament Bill even if 'they had been defeated'. Candidates should recognise this as a reference to the Finance Bill and the first Parliament Bill. C could also be seen as evidence for the interpretation in that the author admits/implies the House of Lords was inclined to block bills, when they judged such action as 'a necessary safeguard against legislation that would threaten such liberties'. His allegation is that the Liberals were motivated by groups who were jealous of property and wealth.</p> <p>An extension of the Liberal reform programme argument is that the Liberals wanted to reform the Lords simply to increase their power. Some candidates might argue that this was part and parcel of their desire to secure their legislative programme. D and E stress the point that the Liberals wanted more power. In warning the Lords not to 'do anything which cannot but serve the purpose of the Liberals in destroying its (the Lords) power for good' the author of D implies that this would be to the advantage of the Liberals. Indeed, the significance of the earlier reference to the 'introduction of Peers' could be examined to explain how new Peers, once appointed, would be permanent and so give the Liberals control of the upper House. A similar view is expressed in E which claims the Liberals intended 'the destruction of the power of the House of Lords', and accuses the Liberals of seizing 'a despotic power'. In this respect E goes further than D and may be considered an irrational position, not least because E refers to 'the Liberal government as a revolutionary committee'. Further, Bonar Law's accusation that the Liberals were dishonest – their pledge to reform the House of Lords 'has been broken' – and they were</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>guilty of ‘fraud’ suggests the degree of bitterness he and other Tories felt in the wake of their defeat on the Parliament Bill. D may have been as concerned about its implications but his remarks were made during the debate when he was trying to adopt a practical position. C implies the Liberals were intent on increasing their power at the expense of individual liberty and regarded resistance to them as essential: the Liberals were a threat and the traditional role of the Lords to protect ‘the liberties of the people’ should be maintained. There was a case here in that the Liberals had lost their overall majority in the two 1910 elections and thus, in part, their mandate to do certain things. However, A refutes any charge that the Liberals were primarily concerned with power arguing that the power of the House of Lords had been eroded ‘not through the battering of external enemies (like the Liberals) but from internal decay.’</p> <p>In judgement, candidates should recognise that the reform of the Lords was motivated, in part, as a matter of principle but it was not the sole reason. Views on what reason was most important may be offered but candidates have the chance, at least, to demonstrate that motives varied. They might conclude that it was principle given the clear Liberal statements in A and B. C and E are both irrational and intemperate (although perhaps in tune with key elements of the period), one from a traditional landed family, the other from an embittered leader in a speech well known for its dangerously unconstitutional advice to Ulster Unionists. However D is more measured in its assessment of Liberal motives.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)	<p>Context. By 1944-5 Churchill was concerned about the failure of the USA to see the Russian threat to Eastern Europe and conscious that Britain had become, militarily, the junior partner to both the USSR and the US. In Moscow in December 1944 he tried to use a personal meeting with Stalin to secure ‘spheres of influence’ in the Balkans, still seeing the Eastern Mediterranean as a vital area for Britain, hence the importance of Greece in this. In May 1945 things had moved on; Roosevelt had died and the incoming president was more anti-Communist; Russian forces had moved further into Eastern Europe. The interpretation of free and fair elections agreed on in Yalta in February had not been the same for Stalin as for the western leaders and it was clear that there would be Russian domination of ‘liberated’ Eastern Europe. Churchill was very constrained by the overwhelming difference between the military power of Britain and that of both the USSR and the USA.</p> <p>Similarities: A suggests friendship with the USSR, confidentially agreeing a cynical pact; Confirmed in E ‘I have always worked for friendship’. Churchill’s worries about Russian power in E are reflected in A ‘Don’t let us get at cross purposes’ and his desire to protect Greece and Yugoslavia from total domination. His conceding in A of influence in Romania and Bulgaria accords with his recognition of Russian strength as seen in E. Both were of less importance to Britain’s eastern Mediterranean concerns.</p> <p>Differences: Churchill has seemingly less concern about Russian power in the Balkans in A as it agrees to 50% control in Yugoslavia and full control in Rumania – yet more concern in E -‘overwhelming influence’. There is more worry about Russian power generally in E, not shown in the cordial agreement in A. Obviously there is no reference in A to the subsequent Yalta disagreement, and no concern that relations with USSR might be seen as cynical in E as opposed to A. There is a compliance with extension of that power in A not shown in E.</p> <p>Provenance - The different contexts of meeting in Moscow and post Yalta might explain the differences – by 1945 Russian expansion was more evident. Churchill is dealing with different audiences –he is trying to control a dictator in A on his home territory and trying to influence a new president at a distance in E. The purpose in A may be to show how there was some attempt to be realistic and get a settlement to protect at least part of Eastern Europe although traditional British interests are also obvious; in E the purpose is to alert the US leader to the dangers without seeming too extreme an opponent of the Communists, still allies in the War.</p>	30	<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
	<p>Judgement: E might be more typical of Churchill's views on Russia – concerns about their military power and their political ambitions – even though there is some need to maintain a moderate stance – Yalta is 'misinterpreted' and possibly to justify some over optimism about the possibility of dealing with Stalin. A might be typical of Churchill's need to maintain the Russian war effort, maintaining good relations with Stalin as a diplomatic and military necessity and to protect British interests with very little to back any agreement up. It may also play to Churchill's belief in personal deals and his recognition that the US would not approve. Source E is more typical of his real views given that A are his alleged comments to Stalin himself. Some may consider his memoirs unreliable but to admit to such a 'deal' gives it an authentic flavour.</p>		
(b)	<p>All the sources, but especially A, C ('chorus of approval') and E may be seen to support a realistic policy towards the USSR, bearing in mind the need to continue the wartime alliance and Britain's weak position within it. Realism is shown in most strongly in E – the anxiety about Russian influence in the Balkans; acknowledging that Stalin did keep his word in Greece but was using techniques to take control and had considerable military capacity. The reference to 'misinterpretation' of Yalta might be lack of realism, or might be a realistic way of not admitting to the new President that allies were unrealistic in order to keep his support. This is a document intended to persuade an incoming president of dangers which Churchill thought his predecessor did not take seriously enough and prevent a US retreat into isolation as happened after the First World War, It was written at a time when Russian intentions were becoming clearer. A could also be seen as 'realpolitik' with ideological differences and public opinion being put aside to get spheres of influence and to protect British interests in the Eastern Mediterranean. It was not without success as Stalin did not interfere in Greece, Yugoslavia eventually became neutral in the communist world, while Bulgaria and Rumania became Soviet satellites as envisaged in the agreement.</p> <p>The alternative – a lack of realism – is best seen in Sources B, C and, if interpreted as naïve, D. However, as B suggests there was no reason why Stalin would need to keep to it – his easy acceptance may indicate the total lack of importance of it for him. It was also somewhat unrealistic, perhaps, for Churchill to pursue this sort of personal diplomacy regardless of the USA and regardless of previous events, as he admits in A and the historian in B points out. It does show him rather lacking in the moral concern that had been part of his earlier criticisms not only of the Hitler Stalin pact, but also of British appeasement – something that the debate in parliament (Source C) uncomfortably</p>	70	<p>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</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>reminded him. Knight’s view in B that in a broader sense it was unrealistic to try and do business with Stalin may be considered; but it might be seen that Churchill had little alternative if he wanted to try and keep Russia as much away from the Eastern Mediterranean, Suez and the route to India and the oil wells of the Middle East as possible. Of course, this view may be seen as unrealistic in itself, trying to maintain Britain’s former strategic and imperial position. C may be seen as too idealistic a view contrary to the type of realistic policy Churchill was forced to follow at Yalta. The war was still going on. In practice nothing could have stopped Stalin doing what he liked in Poland, so some sort of negotiation on the Balkans might have been more realistic than confrontation on a 1940 level without assured US support and with an exhausted Britain still fighting in Europe and the Far East. On the other hand, Churchill may have been unrealistic to think that he would escape censure from some in his party about what seemed like appeasement of Stalin. McEwan in C of course did not have to take the hard decisions that Churchill had been faced with. D may be seen as linked to A in being a realistic attempt to deal with Russia – it was realistic to put aside previous differences and give support to Russia in 1941 and realistic to accept Russian territorial changes in Poland to defend itself against future invasion by moving its frontiers westwards. However, whether the sort of personal appeal for good relations and some accommodation with the democratic Poles was particularly realistic given the situation set out by B may be questioned. Russia had lost millions of men and Stalin was justifiably more concerned about security than the rights of the Poles over whom he had established a brutal tyranny following the 1939 pact and whose leaders he had slaughtered at Katyn – something that Churchill had kept covered up. On the other hand Churchill still needed Russian support in the war and Japan’s armies had not been decisively beaten, so perhaps appeals of friendship were realistic in context.</p> <p>Judgement will depend on how candidates use context and provenance. Did Churchill play a weak hand well and in a ‘realistic’ manner or could he have acted differently, taken the moral high ground and not appeared to play into Stalin’s hands merely to preserve a war effort that Russia would inevitably see through to the end anyway ? The Churchill sources, A, D and E, two of which are to Stalin, one to Truman, demonstrate his ‘piggy in the middle’ problem. A and D to Stalin represents a certain amount of pleading which can be interpreted either way. That to Truman is much more realistic although its purpose is to bring the US on side in the coming post-war era when the Soviets threatened to dominate Europe. The historical view in B, of an unrealistic Churchill, omits much of the above as</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	well as the context of continuing Mediterranean, strategic and imperial concerns. Its accusation of unrealism, like C, is based on the high moral ground taken by Churchill in opposition pre 1940. Candidates might question the 'realism' of both B and C.		

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 2014

