

# **History A**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

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

## **Mark Scheme for January 2011**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

**Question (a) Maximum mark 30**

	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>AO2a</b>
<b>1</b>	13-14	15-16
<b>2</b>	11-12	13-14
<b>3</b>	9-10	10-12
<b>4</b>	7-8	8-9
<b>5</b>	5-6	6-7
<b>6</b>	3-4	3-5
<b>7</b>	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)**

<b>A0s</b>	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>A02a</b>
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"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
<b>Level 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness.</li> <li>• Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively.</li> </ul> <p><b>13-14</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>15-16</b></p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts.</li> <li>• Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly.</li> </ul> <p><b>11-12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question.</li> </ul> <p><b>13-14</b></p>
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent.</li> </ul> <p><b>9-10</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely.</li> </ul> <p><b>10-12</b></p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted.</li> <li>• A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence.</li> <li>• Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7-8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it.</li> <li>• Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>8-9</b></p>
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding.</li> <li>• Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5-6</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit</li> <li>• Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6-7</b></p>
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context.</li> <li>• Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3-4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic.</li> <li>• Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3-5</b></p>
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance.</li> <li>• Weak or non existent context with no conceptual understanding.</li> <li>• No structure with extremely weak communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment.</li> <li>• Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-2</b></p>

**Question (b) Maximum mark 70**

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

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Total mark for the question = 70	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>	<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>
<b>Level 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources.</li> <li>• Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>20-22</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of <b>all</b> the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>42-48</b></p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context.</li> <li>• Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>17-19</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grouped analysis and use of <b>most</b> of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>35-41</b></p>

AOs	A01a and b	A02a and b
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive.</li> <li>• Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-16</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>28-34</b></p>
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential.</li> <li>• Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9-12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described.</li> <li>• May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>21-27</b></p>

<b>AOs</b>	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>Ao2a and b</b>
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement.</li> <li>• Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5-8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped.</li> <li>• There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general.</li> <li>• There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14-20</b></p>
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question.</li> <li>• Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Little organisation or structure with poor communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3-4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation.</li> <li>• A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content.</li> <li>• No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7-13</b></p>
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question.</li> <li>• No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context.</li> <li>• Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive.</li> <li>• No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately.</li> <li>• No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-6</b></p>

## 1 (a) Study Sources B and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for views of Necker's financial policies.

[30]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources

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

The issue here is whether Necker's idea of basing financial stability on openness and confidence in public lending to the crown was the right path. Necker aimed at increasing public confidence as his main strategy by the famous *Compte Rendu*. Both the accuracy and the wisdom of this have been questioned and it certainly gave his enemies ammunition.

*Content:* **B** is suggesting that Necker has a sound grasp of finance with the expectation that Louis will be able to reduce expenditure and guarantee loans (implicitly under Necker's guidance). **C** speaks of the 'improper and costly ways' that Necker has raised money and his inability to engender confidence. Really **B** is suggesting that at heart the financial system is sound; **C** is suggesting that Necker is more the problem than the solution and has destabilised finance to the extent that it would be unwise to publish the accounts. The main disagreement is about the proposal to follow the English system and publish accounts. For **B** this is at the heart of increasing confidence and to demystify the financial system. For **C** the English system is bad because it suggests that the English do not trust their ruler and need to be shown how finance is being handled. In France publication would create doubt not confidence. At root there are two political philosophies here – Necker advocating transparency and accountability, his rival stressing unquestioning obedience with no need for sharing information or the secrets of royal government.

*Provenance:* both are contemporary sources, both urging a policy with implications for the whole nature of royal government. Neither is offering a balanced analysis, both are writing to persuade and justify a view point. Both are writing against a background of financial problems brought on by war and an unsound financial system. Necker – a protestant Swiss with international banking experience and a wider view of the world - was from a background very different from Vergennes. Vergennes is writing with a more political motive – to condemn a rival. Both are useful for the views on financial policies. **C** could be seen as more typical of views of the wisdom of Necker's policy in court circles.

*Judgement:* some may feel Necker's was the wiser policy – though without a sustained overhaul of financial policy and without the whole hearted support of the King, it may have had limited chance of success and the rather misleading publication of the accounts may have actually worsened the situation and weakened the monarchy by opening up the prospect of greater public participation in government which Louis was not ready to deliver. Others may feel that Vergennes might have had some justification – there was a core of loyalty to the King which it was dangerous to undermine. However others will feel this is simply selfish political intrigue, ignoring serious financial problems and in the long term fatally weakening the monarchy. Some may see **C** as more useful for assessing how unwise Necker was to attempt this type of reform against the background of political rivalry and entrenched attitudes. Some may see **B** as more useful as an explanation for the wisdom of a radical policy, especially given the context of the American war.

**(b) Study all the Sources.**

**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the failure of Louis XVI's ministers was the main reason for continuing financial problems between 1774 and 1787. [70]**

Broadly **A, B and D** suggest that ministers were not to blame; **C and E** suggest that they were inadequate. The fact that the other sources indicate continuing policies might be argued to show that Turgot failed. **A, B and D** are of course ministers promoting their own policies and are not objective; **C** is a rival to a leading minister offering criticism with a motive of justifying himself. Only the historian is attempting any objective statement. There is nothing here from the point of view of a contemporary affected by these policies. **D** shows a radical set of measures as the problems worsened. The need for control of expenditure may show that Louis was more at the root of the problem than the weaknesses of his ministers (**A and E**). Some may show that Calonne as well as Necker in contrast to Vergennes in **C** saw that there was a need for more openness and participation which if developed and supported by the King might have eased the crisis and saved the monarchy. Others may feel that an invitation to limited participation in discussion of reform by a class hostile to change in the Assembly of Notables was a dangerous idea rather than a sensible solution. However, Calonne's analysis is not unsound and it could be argued that responsibility falls not on either crown, or ministers or war but on the selfishness of the privileged. What **D** does not show is the failure of Calonne to manage debt and spending; being intended to persuade and show his own wisdom the source gives a somewhat misleading impression of his effectiveness. This is certainly argued in **E** which shows Calonne borrowing on all sides. However, the thrust of **E** in contrast with the 'official' sources **A-D** is that the King was to blame. The traditional picture of a parasitic court is offered. The tone of this may seem rather unbalanced. The King had attempted change and court expenditure, though irritating to the reformers and giving a bad impression to the public, was not at the heart of the financial problem as much as war debts and the inability, because of entrenched vested interests, to achieve fundamental reforms which would give the state access to an adequate share of the wealth of the nation.

**A** seems to be offering wise words – the reduction of spending rather than raising new taxes or loans. However, there is little here about any fundamental reform of the unfair system of taxation. There is a reference to increasing prosperity which does not figure in the other suggestions and which might indicate that Turgot takes a broader view – he was linked to the Physiocrats and had promoted the creation of wealth as an Intendant. He was a devotee of free trade and improved communication. Turgot fell foul of court faction and was not supported by the King – some may argue that had Louis taken more heed earlier on then crisis might have been averted. However the reference to the 'first cannonball' shows the main problem – war. The American War, though a success, increased financial problems.

**B** offers another solution, but some may argue that it fell short of the radical reforms needed in the wake of the war and ignored the problems of open government in a system like that of France. Some may argue that the accounts were inaccurate and encouraged complacency. The reliance on managed public debt may seem to some more of a short term fix than a long-term solution – there is nothing here to encourage the creation of wealth. The criticisms of **C** may be seen as merely selfish and an indication that the ministers faced internal jealousies, revealing a lack of understanding of the need for long term reform among the privileged orders. Its tone is autocratic and misplaced. Both **B and C** show the rivalries – some may know that the Queen made these worse and some may blame Louis for not taking a firmer view and supporting his reformers.

The main debate here is whether Turgot's policies of generating wealth by free trade, and, as **A** says, the improvement of agriculture, together with controlling expenditure might have been the best hope for improving the financial stability and therefore the long-term future of the monarchy. Turgot in fact generated considerable popular discontent by attempting a free trade in grain and had little political vision. Alternatively, Necker's policy in **B** of widening the investment base and guaranteeing the credit of the monarchy might have taken a broader reforming approach. By making the finances more open, Louis might have given the message that he was working with his subjects and moved more to the English model. Necker has been criticised for playing down the seriousness of the financial crisis and encouraging hopes for change. Calonne's policy of attempting to get the support of leading subjects for a more equitable taxation system and a reduction of privilege in **D** might be seen by some as the best solution for longer-term political and financial stability. Calonne has been seen as failing to curb spending and then relying on a dangerous short term expedient of an Assembly of Notables which served only to reveal the deep-rooted aversion of the privileged classes to change; bringing the revolution closer. On the other hand, there is the failure of the King to support his ministers, the overspending by the Crown, the costs of war (which is the background to **B** and **C** and is referred to in **E**), the selfishness of the privileged classes and the underlying weaknesses of the financial system inherited by Louis in 1774. There are many different approaches possible here and no set information should be looked for.

## 2 (a) Study Sources D and E.

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the peace negotiations between Austria and Piedmont following the battle of Novara, March 1849. [30]**

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

Candidates are likely to highlight some of the following **similarities** and **differences**. Some may focus on the terms identified. Both sources confirm that the Piedmontese army was to be reduced to a 'peace footing' (**Source D**) and one 'capable of preserving order in Piedmont' (**Source E**). The joint occupation of Alessandria by Piedmont and Austria is highlighted in both sources. However, in **Source D** Victor Emmanuel apparently suggests this, whilst in **Source E** he is said to have had reservations about the arrangement and is advised by Abercrombie to pursue further discussion. Relations between those negotiating peace should be considered. **Both sources** explain that Austria's distrust and dislike of Charles Albert accounts for the hard line they adopted with him whereas Victor Emmanuel, who succeeded Charles Albert, was clearly more acceptable to the Austrians if only because he was willing to negotiate with them. However, Austria's intentions towards Victor Emmanuel are expressed differently. **Source D** emphasises the need to secure the King's position in order to gain stability in Piedmont whereas in **Source E** it is claimed that 'the Austrians want to restrict the King' and 'make Piedmont a puppet to Austria'.

Evaluation of the provenance is likely to focus on the authors. Radetsky, in **Source D**, as the general in command, is assessing the situation from an Austrian and practical perspective whilst Abercromby, in **Source E**, as a diplomat, is concerned to promote English interests which, he at least, seems to suggest were best served by ensuring Piedmont was as strong as possible. An associated point of evaluation is the audience addressed by both authors. Radetsky in **Source D** is justifying his actions and explaining them to his political masters based on the situation as he sees it from the perspective of a military leader and one able to advise those in Vienna. Abercromby in **Source E** is trying to portray Austria in a bad light with the objective of encouraging his government to respond, evident in the last line. The dates help explain the difference, too. **Source D** is commenting on the early discussions and the armistice terms only. By contrast, **Source E** was written nearer the time the final treaty was signed so the author had had time to assess the way negotiations had moved and this might also account for the apparent change in the attitude of Victor Emmanuel in that time. On the basis of how candidates evaluate these points will depend how they regard the evidence in terms of its reliability or the comparative value of the sources and then judgement. Both are equally useful.

- (b) **Study all the Sources.**  
**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Piedmontese ambition was the main reason for the failure of the revolutions of 1848-49.** [70]

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

It could be argued that **A, C and E** suggest misplaced Piedmontese ambition as crucial to failure, whilst **B and D** suggest other factors – internal division and the strength of Austria. **Source C** also suggests that Piedmont was insufficiently bold and ambitious. **Source A** suggests that Piedmontese demands of other states, in return for defence against the Austrians, were unacceptably high as far as some were concerned. The tenor of this source is one of suspicion of Piedmontese ambition and concern about what Venetia will lose if she concedes to Piedmontese demands that Charles Albert become their king. Tommaseo argues that partnership with Piedmont would serve the revolution better than absorption of Venetia by Piedmont. In evaluating the source candidates are likely to dismiss the opposition of the author as unsurprising given his political views and that they represented the minority view, as indicated in the introduction. However, those aware that Piedmont was defeated at Custoza on 24 July, might argue that, despite the author's bias, his views were not unreasonable. Some candidates might link this to **Source D** by picking up on the 'untrustworthiness' of Charles Albert. This view was probably based on the fact that having been defeated in 1848 he broke the terms of the peace brokered then to revive hostilities a year later. Although an Austrian perspective it could be argued that the King's actions were reflective of his ambition which proved disastrous to the revolutionary cause.

**Source C** is critical of Piedmontese ambition as being *insufficient*. Charles Albert is a hesitant figure who missed opportunities open to him. Although Piedmont was in a better position than Austria at the start of hostilities their advantage was not exploited. Charles Albert 'annexed just Lombardy', implying he should have been more ambitious, that he failed to disrupt the Austrians as they 'regrouped' and of compound blunders in the conduct of the military campaign against the Austrians. In evaluating the provenance candidates might explain the forthright criticism of Pisacane as the understandable indignation a professional soldier would feel at perceived incompetence by his commanders and the bruising experience of defeat. Candidates may be able to provide contextual knowledge about the military operations in the North and so assess the validity of the charges made against Charles Albert.

According to the evidence the failure of the revolutions can be explained by factors other than Piedmontese ambition. Indeed, **Source B** suggests that Piedmontese ambition was laudable and deserving of support: instead, they were let down by others. Particular opprobrium is heaped on the citizens of Rome as 'reluctant to enrol as soldiers' and raise 'extra taxation to pay for the war'. This might be explained by the reference to the internal divisions within the peninsula of a cultural and political nature which could be elaborated further. The Pope is a specific target who stands accused of having 'abandoned the Piedmontese army when it alone was facing the common enemy'. Candidates may mention the Allocution and explain its consequences. In evaluating the authorship candidates might regard the source as the reliable view of a neutral and a representative of a state with no direct interest in Italian affairs. On the other hand, a clear sense of disappointment is conveyed in

these comments and some may claim that an anti-Austrian view is unsurprising given the history of Austria in Belgium.

The strength of Austria was a major factor in explaining the failure of the revolutions. Radetsky is identified in **Sources C** and **E** as a superior commander. Both acknowledge the importance of intelligence; **Source C** describes 'secret agents at work in Turin' which **Source E** explains meant Radetsky 'was well informed' and able to use such intelligence to effect in 'correctly estimating the military situation'. His strategy and the strength of his army are conceded in both with **Source E** referring to his 'success in invading Piedmont' and **Source C** mentions his use of Verona and predictable victories subsequently. The events alluded to, which candidates might expand upon, are sufficient to evaluate both sources as reliable so even opponents of the Austrians had no choice but to recognise the superiority of the latter. Even **Source D** confirms this factor as crucial in explaining the outcome of the war. Radetsky's concessions to Victor Emmanuel were generous and can only be explained by his confidence in the superiority of his forces.

There are many different approaches possible here and no set information should be looked for.

## 3 (a) Study Sources A and B

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the debate on the admission of Missouri to the Union.**

**[30]**

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

There are several points on which the sources can be compared. **Source A** regards the restriction on slavery in Missouri as unconstitutional and **Source B** concedes there was a danger that the South would secede over the matter emphasising the importance of principle which the South championed. Both imply that the future of the Union was in question. The House of Representatives is described as opposed to slavery. This is made clear in **Source A** (lines 5-6) and by the general tenor of **Source B** which is a comment on the views of the House of Representatives in the last line of the **Source B**. There is agreement that the South had to compromise as indicated in the last lines of **Source A** and the final sentence of **Source B**. There is some common ground on the Louisiana Purchase with **Source B** claiming the deal as 'a great gain' although the author admits to some regret about the Compromise agreed. A similar reluctance is evident in **Source A** as the last line suggests the deal struck was only the best possible rather than the ideal. **Source B** concedes the slaveholders were united which is implied in **Source A**. Both testify to the intensity of the debate: see line 1 of **Source A** and line 2 of **Source B**).

There is some disagreement on the attitude of Northern opinion. **Source A** refers to the public in the North as in 'a frenzy' implying strong and uncompromising views on the subject whereas **Source B** describes Northern Representatives as divided. In general, **Source A** sees the compromise as a loss whereas **Source B** regards it as a 'win'.

The views expressed reflect the different sectional interests of the North and South. The hard tone of each, although slightly stronger in **Source A**, perhaps, indicates the depth to which these views were held. In addition, the dates of the sources are worth comment. **Source A** was written before the Missouri Compromise was agreed which might explain why it is less accommodating as the author was still hoping that further progress might be made to promote Southern interests. On the other hand, **Source B** was written just after agreement had been reached so the author's attitude is one of acceptance of the fact. In addition, the recipients of the letters are of interest. **Source A** is updating the Governor of the State he represents in the Senate and it is more official, intended to present the Governor with a straight account of the negotiations as they had developed to that point. **Source B** is written by a son to his father which might explain the frankness of his opinions. The intimacy of the letter is partly explained by the fact that the son maintained regular correspondence with his father.

**(b) Study all the Sources**

**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the Missouri Compromise was inadequate as a solution to the problem of slavery in the Territories. [70]**

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

Inadequacy as a solution can be detected in **Sources A, C** and, from a much later perspective, **E**, although there are nuances to be teased out here (**C** admits a cessation of agitation to the 1840s). The counter-argument, an adequate solution, is to be found in **Sources B** and especially **D**, although there are hints of temporary adequacy elsewhere. **Source A** presents a Southern view just before the Missouri Compromise was agreed whereas **Source E** considers the effect of the Missouri Compromise from a Northerner looking back over many years. There is a difference of perspective, therefore, based on sectional interest and time. **Source A** regards the agreement as inadequate in so far as the restriction on Missouri was 'unconstitutional'. Candidates could elaborate on the importance of States' rights and how the agreement merely reinforced Southern sensitivities on the matter as evident later, for example, in the Nullification Crisis. It is also clear from **Source A** that the arrangement made about the Louisiana Purchase was accepted only grudgingly by the South implying they would likely exploit any chance in future to challenge the deal. Some might cross reference **Source D** to illustrate this. Indeed, some might be aware that the terms concerning Louisiana (the so-called Thomas Proviso) were agreed separately from those on Missouri specifically to make the challenge to the former easier in the future.

If, for different reasons, **Source E** regards the Missouri Compromise as an inadequate solution. For Wilson the Missouri Compromise was a defeat for the North (freedom) and a victory for the South (slavery), a view he based on events after 1820. He is not specific, failing to substantiate his claim (a point some candidates may suggest undermines the value of the source), but candidates should be able to identify with the reference to 'Slave Power' and provide examples of how Northerners perceived the South to have promoted their interests politically. This may also apply to the extension of slavery into the Territories between the 1820s and the 1850s. The fact that the author is described as a radical Northerner might imply to some that his views might be over-drawn, and that Northern fears of the Slave Power verged on the paranoia. Also, the fact that he is writing in 1872 after the defeat of the South in war might explain the forcefulness of his views as a means of justifying the conflict, a point that could be linked to the final sentence which may be part autobiographical.

**Source C** seems to support the view that the Missouri Compromise was inadequate at least in the late 1840s with the problem of Texas and lands from Mexico. Indeed, he thinks 'the North no longer respects the Missouri Compromise' implying that they no longer think it adequate. This charge might be considered typical of a Southerner active for so long in defence of Southern interests (some knowledge of Calhoun's role in politics might be offered). However, candidates will know that he was speaking in the context of a debate which culminated in the Compromise of 1850 in which the Missouri Compromise was upheld. Furthermore, he concedes that 'the subject of slavery in the territories ceased to agitate the country' from 1820 to the 1840s due to the Missouri Compromise.

This view is clearly shared by Lincoln in **Source D** who presents a strong defence of the Missouri Compromise as a result of which he claims there 'was peace and quiet'. He believes the Missouri Compromise should not have been repealed and the trouble arising from Kansas-Nebraska would have been averted. Candidates could provide details about this crisis to confirm the seriousness of it claimed by Lincoln. In evaluating the source Lincoln's credentials as someone whose policy of defending the Union he hoped would serve himself well politically might be assessed. Indeed, the speech had the desired effect of making him known outside his own state for the first time.

This theme is echoed in **Source B** which seems to suggest the Missouri Compromise was adequate as the Union was preserved. Despite its imperfections - 'we have lost Missouri' - he considers the deal over the Louisiana Purchase as a 'great gain' and that overall perhaps they 'ought not to regret that it ended in compromise'. However, he recognises the division between North and South and 'the rage which prevailed here' which implies uncertain prospects for the future. Indeed, the view expressed is only helpful in considering the immediate effectiveness of the Missouri Compromise and cannot offer much about the long term adequacy of the Missouri Compromise. There are many different approaches possible here and no set information should be looked for.

## Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-63

## 4 (a) Study Sources A and B.

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the popularity of the Nazis. [30]**

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

The Sources are **similar** in content in that both suggest that the Nazis were very popular among young people and develop this in some detail. **Source A** sees the attraction of the youth movements and the way in which parents and school are overridden. **Source A** refers to the hope of a job and in 1934 when unemployment was still high this could well have been a major consideration. Both Sources see an element of something more than mere popularity, **Source A** says people were *fanatics* and **Source B** says they *idolise* and *worship* Hitler as a saviour. Both sources stress the role of Hitler in this, **B** more so than **A**. There are touches of an alternative view. **A** makes the point that youth still favours the regime, as do the peasants and possibly the unemployed. This might imply that other groups do not favour it, although 1934 is quite early for this to be said.

The Sources also **differ**. **Source B** makes no mention of the middle classes, only the young and the old. It says directly that criticism of the government is not allowed in public, but that this does not seem to detract from Hitler's popularity. **Source B** makes it clear that other Nazis were less popular. **Source A** adds other groups with whom the Nazis are popular, such as peasants because they trust Hitler, unlike the Weimar government, because they no longer feel inferior as they have no interest in intellectual pursuits. **Source B** comments on the elderly, who trust Hitler more than Weimar politicians.

The **provenance** and **context** of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. The SPD was in exile and so relied on reports coming out of Germany. Lloyd George had actually been to Germany. He did not necessarily see what his hosts wanted to hide, but if he heard criticisms of Nazi speeches, he was not totally cocooned. As an enemy of Germany in WWI, Lloyd George might be seen as unlikely to be easily impressed, but he had been out of office since 1922, and he was himself a charismatic politician. He is writing two years later than the SPD report, when the Nazis were more entrenched, but by which time some disillusion with some Nazi leaders had germinated. The SPD had plenty of agents in Germany but they were, obviously, hostile to the Nazis and so their recognition that support was still strong among some groups is convincing. They were hoping the Nazis would be short lived so their realistic analysis is probably reliable. The final sentence in **Source A** gives the particular impression that it will take some major event to change the minds of the *lads*.

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.

**(b) Study all the Sources.**

**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the Gestapo was the main reason for the lack of resistance to the Nazi regime.** [70]

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 question, but no set conclusion is expected.

The Sources contain references to different interpretations, so they may be grouped according to their view. The **supporting** view that the Gestapo were the main reason for the lack of resistance can be found in **Sources C** and **D** and by implication in **Source E**. The **opposing** view, that the regime faced little resistance because it had popular support features in **Sources A** and **B**.

The **supporting** argument in **Source D** shows that there was resistance from young people. But this did not amount to much as their fate illustrates. In this case the group was easily penetrated by a Gestapo agent and dismissed as unimportant. The plotters survived. The Communist writing in **Source E** after the war takes a very pragmatic view, which was not shared by those who did carry out leafleting. But by implication, the likely fate of protestors in Gestapo hands was enough to deter them from serious resistance. **Source C**, ironically from a Nazi report, shows that the Gestapo was alarmed at the possibility of resistance and took it seriously. They knew the SPD was still active, as **Source A** attests, and were determined to get proof to use against them. The fact that the Gestapo relied on the legal process to dismember the opposition does not detract from the power they had at their command.

The **opposing** argument is found in **Sources A** and **B** which explain the appeal of the Nazis and the admiration of Hitler. The hope of a job for the working class unemployed, not natural Nazi supporters and the support of groups like peasants shows that resistance was unlikely from such people as the SPD appreciated. Hitler was so widely idolised that his overthrow could not seem probable. Even the hint of criticism in **Source B** does not show any prospect of resistance. A few hostile remarks about the oratorical skills of some Nazis would not lead to their downfall, especially as Hitler himself could more than hold his own in this arena. Lloyd George was certainly impressed and did not expect the Third Reich to last only a few years.

The **provenance** and **context** of the Sources should be integrated into the discussion. **Source D** shows that the only way of overcoming Gestapo power might be to assassinate Hitler and candidates could refer to the July Plot and its failure, which was not due to the Gestapo. Other examples of resistance could be put forward such as the Swing movement, Edelweiss pirates and the White Rose movement. These were all dealt with by the Gestapo but the author did clearly survive. **Sources D** and **E** are written after the war was over but, although **Source E** suggests some people exaggerated what they had done to resist Hitler once he was safely dead. The author recognised how futile resistance had been. **Source D** may not be typical (a boarding school implies a private education with an upper class view) and would suggest that the lack of resistance was owed to both Nazi appeal and Gestapo penetration. **Source C** as a Gestapo report is admitting that there was resistance, albeit quite low level, and is thus likely to be reliable. Sources should be the main focus rather than knowledge about resistance to the Nazis and why it failed.

Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.

5 **The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945-75**  
**The Early Course of the Korean War 1950-51**

(a) **Study Sources C and E**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for reasons why General MacArthur was dismissed as Commander of the United Nations forces in Korea. [30]**

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

The Sources agree that General MacArthur disagreed with a limited war policy. They agree that his pursuit of his own strategy would extend the war with very damaging results - 'large-scale war with Communist China' in **Source C** and 'a Third World War' in **Source E**. Though mentioned only implicitly in **Source E**, as 'the free world', the uneasiness of United Nations participating countries is blamed for the limitations on his actions, resulting in his frustrations and outspokenness. A similar view might be inferred from Truman's statement in **Source E** that he feared 'confusion' over the 'real aim' of American policy, i.e. he was 'trying earnestly to reassure uneasy allies'. MacArthur's disagreements with Truman and the Joint Chiefs of Staff feature in **both Sources** - developed obliquely as 'a number of events' in Source E. Contextual knowledge might be used to evaluate and extend this comment, including MacArthur's high-handedness, disregard of Truman, threats to use atomic weapons and pressure on China.

But the Sources also disagree. **Source E** presents the dismissal as part of a limited war policy, to avoid a waste of American lives, to prevent needless jeopardy to the free world and to prevent a Third World War. **Source C**, on the other hand, presents 'limited war' as an un-American United Nations policy, in line with right wing views. Contextual knowledge useful in evaluation might include Republican or McCarthyist criticisms of Truman's weakness in allowing China to fall to Communism in 1949 and disagreements with Britain over its recognition of China. **Source C** prioritises the cause of MacArthur's dismissal as 'selfish interests in Europe' - specifically 'British fears that his actions might involve the west in a large-scale war with Communist China'. Truman emphasises potential losses of American lives and a more objective view that confusion had developed over the real aim of US policy and he is clarifying this.

The **provenance** of **Source E**, when linked to its rather oblique tone, suggests that Truman was trying not to lose face with the American public, many of whom thought 'limited war' was a humiliating policy. Republicans and isolationists would not support US action caused by UN pressure, yet Truman knew the US commitments in Europe precluded its independent action. **Source E** is the President's spontaneous response to events, while **Source C** supports MacArthur's stance and is written four years later, after the Korean War had dragged on and ended in a humiliating 'limited victory', so may be less reliable. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.

**(b) Study all the Sources**

**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that America had little influence on the course of the Korean War between October 1950 and April 1951. [70]**

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

The Sources argue in support of and against the argument, so they may be grouped accordingly. The argument in support of the interpretation, that America had little influence on the course of the Korean War at that time, appears in **Sources A, D** and to an extent **B**. The argument against the interpretation appears in **Sources B, C and E**, and to an extent **A**, which argue that MacArthur and Truman were major influences on the course of the war.

The argument in support of the interpretation is in **Source A**, where Low's cartoon expresses the view that India and the Asian countries may decide not to accept western influence in Asia if UN forces under the command of MacArthur cross the 38th parallel. **Knowledge** might include America's use of the UN General Assembly to get support for MacArthur's advance. Cross-reference with **Source B** shows close relations between India and Communist China, which had become the champion of the newly independent Asian ex-colonies, referred to in the final line of **Source B**. **Source B** shows Mao privately threatening to shape the course of the War should 'American' troops advance into North Korean territory. The fact that the **provenance** of **Source B** is a British Foreign Office telegram and that of **Source A** is a British newspaper cartoon, supports the view that Britain also had influence on the course of the War by urging a limited conflict. This view is strengthened by cross-reference with **Source C** - 'British fears that MacArthur might involve the west in a large-scale war with Communist China' and selfish interests in Europe. **Knowledge** used in evaluation might include Britain's recognition of Communist China, while the USA recognised Nationalist China alongside whom the British did not wish to fight.

The Sources also support argument against the interpretation. **Source D** argues that the USA *could* shape the War as a local war, implying that it was not arming South Korea to defend itself or willing to extend the war, a view agreed with by Truman in **Source E**. **Source D**'s content might also be used to argue that the USA *did* influence the course of events by limiting the scope of the War, and restraining MacArthur's actions, also in **Sources C and E**. **Source B** refers to United Nations troops as 'American' showing MacArthur's domination of military strategies. **Source E** also suggests this, as the only way Truman was able to restrain him was to dismiss him as Supreme Commander of United Nations Forces in Korea. By doing so he showed US control in conducting a limited war. **Source E** also argues that Truman freely chose a limited war strategy, to save American lives and reduce the risk of a global war, involving China and the newly nuclear power of the USSR. **Source D** emphasises this danger, but implies desperation and lack of influence by South Korea.

The **provenance** of the grouped Sources should be integrated into the evaluation of their arguments. All the Sources have their subjective purpose, audience and tone. **Sources A and B** suggest an Asian stance, revealing the pressures on Truman, who was committed to defence of the free world, as he states in Source E. **Knowledge** might refer to Europe as his priority, making independent action in Korea impossible to man and fund. In **Source B**, Chou En-lai is indirectly informing a

supportive British Foreign Office of the danger of China's involvement in Korea with the purpose of pressurising Truman into limiting MacArthur's action - a veiled threat. **Knowledge** might be used here, in that the USA lacked diplomatic relations with Communist China, as it recognised only Nationalist China. **Source E** adopts a diplomatic tone to hide US tensions and divisions on policy. **Source C** is informed, supportive of MacArthur and written with hindsight by an extreme right wing adviser who left Korea when MacArthur was dismissed. The Sources supporting the argument are perhaps less subjective than those opposing it.

It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2011

