

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

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

Mark Scheme for June 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

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

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

Notes related to Part A:

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

Marking Grid for Question (a)

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

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

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

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

Notes related to Part B:

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

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<p>Total mark for the question = 70</p>	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
<p>Level 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p style="text-align: center;">20-22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation. • Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer. <p style="text-align: center;">42-48</p>
<p>Level 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p style="text-align: center;">17-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent. • Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">35-41</p>

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>

1 (a) Study Sources A and B.

Compare these Sources as evidence for the reasons for the attack on the Bastille.

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 background to these Sources is the fears brought about by the dismissal of the reforming minister Necker, the troop movements near to the capital, the economic hardships experienced by the people and the uncertainty about the King's intentions towards accepting the participation of the States General in government. Both come from newspapers and both express sympathy with an event of some violence.

Both these Sources come from newspaper accounts written close to the time – one for a Parisian readership and one for a provincial readership. Their tone reflects the excitement of the time.

Content: Both agree on the popular fears of a royalist backlash but differ in their emphasis of the longer term causes. Both are sympathetic to the people – in **A** there is a reference to suffering, but it is **B** who links the resentment to much longer-term causes of discontent. Both indicate slaughter by royalists was expected but **A**, possibly reflecting its Parisian origins, is more graphic and specific. It also mentions the six princes which **B** does not. Both indicate that the Estates General will be targeted and there is a threat to the assembly and the whole idea of a constitutional France in which elected representatives make laws. Neither mentions the King as being the origin of the proposed attacks. Where they differ is in the background – for **B** the significance is that the proposed counter-revolution is seen as the culmination of centuries of privileged oppression whereas **A** gives the impression that it is the immediate threat, albeit in the context of 'suffering' people that is the most significant. **A** is more specific than **B** about the radical centre of the Palais Royal being a target – again something that might figure in an account by a radical Parisian. **Source A** is slightly closer to the events than **Source B**, possibly accounting for the greater degree of reflection on the significance of the events in a longer-term context than the other. **Both** are useful in reflecting the paranoid atmosphere in the capital, with the failure of the King to make his position clear about the reform proposals, the half hearted movement of troops and the lack of communication between government, people and the Assembly. **Neither** makes explicit the economic plight of the Parisians or the extent of political debate in the capital which engendered the heightened emotions which both represent.

Provenance

In terms of provenance, the difference is in the dates, the location of the leadership and the possible intention of the writers – with Mirabeau producing more of an analysis, **Source A** intent on recording the emotions. Contextual knowledge would confirm the accuracy of the extent of fears, but both seek to explain and justify violent acts rather than to present any criticism of the popular action. Both are writing for newspapers and neither is in a position to know the consequences of the actions.

Judgement

Both may be seen as typical of writers caught up in the excitement of the events and there may be discussion about whether **A** stressing the immediacy and intensity of the fears or **B** stressing the context of long term resentment about hundreds of years of oppression may be the more realistic.

(b) Study all the Sources.

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the storming of the Bastille was a triumph for liberty [70]

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

As a **set** these sources are mainly close to the time with only one longer perspective and that written from a passionate and partisan point of view. All reflect the passions of the period which continued long afterwards. **C** offers the strongest defence of the event as a step forward towards liberty. **B** sees the people rising for liberty; **A** sees fear as the key. **D** and **E** provide the main counter view and see not liberty but licence and violence as the characteristic elements of the event.

The debate here is how significant the Storming of the Bastille was: was it an episode of violence such as had not been uncommon in the past and generated by particular fears? Did it herald an epoch of increasing violence in which individuals were sacrificed to extremism or was it the start of a revolutionary epoch of liberty – **B** and **C** written close to the event but not immediately after it agree that it is of significance – **B** sees it as a reaction against a supposed plot which seemed to sum up all the grievances that the people were opposing. **C** supports this by seeing it not as an angry or paranoid reaction but as a day when liberty was established and the world will never be the same. It is interesting that this is relatively soon after the event at the end of the month when the full consequences are yet to be seen. Did contemporaries see it almost at once as a major turning point? Much depends on the viewpoint of the author, because **D**, from a much more conservative stance, sees only rioting and violence. Eighteenth century Parisians indulged in sporadic rioting and this lawyer does not see much more than simply violence without any justification. **C** is a radical pamphlet which may well want to promote change by interpreting the events in terms of a passionate ideological commitment, helping to create the legend that the attack of the Bastille was linked to the desire for liberty and political change and not merely motivated by irrational fears or material discontents. However, **D** like **C** is for public consumption and may be playing down the political or idealistic elements out of fear of the emergence of radicalism in the capital and a fear that mob action may be exploited. Portraying the events as merely rioting may not be the whole truth. Though it is supported in a sense by **A** which stresses actions motivated by fear and suffering and does not see long term causes or potential significance, despite being, like **C** a radical publication. Perhaps the key difference here is between the newspaper reports of **A** and **B** and the political pamphlets of **C** and **D**.

D stresses the violence – it is not the people as a whole as implied in the first three sources, but the worst elements, behaving not out of justified fear of counter revolution but merely as ‘a tribe of cannibals’. The real fears of the people and the hopes for political change are not really considered here by a conservative writer –

but he was actually there. By contrast, **C** sees glory, but **D** sees just horrific violence such as the parading of the severed head of the Bastille's governor.

C is in considerable contrast seeing a victory over tyranny and despair – the storming has a distinct outcome with real significance, not merely violence for its own sake. This is challenged by a later view, a hundred years on and by a distinctly partisan writer. Unlike the previous sources who were close to the events and wrote from distinct viewpoints which were influenced by the passions of their times, this is reflecting from a longer perspective. Where it agrees with **C** is that it had the significance that **D** denies and **A** does not see – the beginning of a revolutionary epoch with more violence to come. This is a chance for candidates to link the violence of the Bastille with the developing violence that characterised the later Revolution – the continuing mob violence of October 1789, the various Paris 'days' culminating in the September Massacres of 1792 through to the Terror. The objection here could be that there is a '*post hoc ergo propter hoc*' aspect to this. The later violence had different causes and there could be a view supported by **A** and **B** that the Bastille was a response to the distinct fears of 1789 which candidates could support by knowledge of the situation that developed between May and July 1789 (though a detailed narrative would not be required). The view of **C** that its significance was that it ushered in a new age of Liberty could be certainly evaluated by contextual knowledge of what followed, and **B**'s claim that the significance was more of a culmination of protest against centuries of oppression could be tested against knowledge. **E** will have been influenced by the anticlerical developments which followed the events of 1789 but no knowledge of the situation in the 1880s is required. The very bleak picture of cannibalism and violence, betrayal and treason is an echo of **D** and a denial of the idealism of **B**. It is open, of course, to criticism. **E** sees the events as leading to the Terror and candidates could discuss this by reference to knowledge of later developments

2 (a) Study Sources A and B.

Compare these Sources as evidence for French intentions in Italy. [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 of **similarity**. In both sources France intends to make war on Austria if justified. **Source A** is explicit on this in line 2 and in **Source B** French support is made conditional on Piedmont being 'attacked by Austria'. A French intention to supply troops is stressed in both with **Source A** specifying an optimum number and **Source B** referring to the appeal of the King for troops. Relations with other states are stressed as important in both: in **Source A** France clearly intends 'not to alarm other powers', especially England, which is implied in **Source B** by the offer of an explanation and reassurance to Victoria but mention could also be made of Napoleon's remark concerning 'other foreign powers', the implication of which is that the French wanted to avoid involving them. In both sources it is made clear that France intends to remove Austria from Italy although in **Source A** this intention is categorical - 'Austria should be driven out totally' - whereas in **Source B** the comment that 'France had always been opposed to the exclusive influence of Austria in Italy' implies that they might settle for the partial removal of Austria. Some may identify an overarching point of **difference** in that **Source A** suggests that French intentions are to serve Italian interests whereas **Source B** makes it clear that French national interests are Napoleon's priority.

This last point might be incorporated into the evaluation of the provenance given that **Source A** is Cavour's interpretation of the agreement made at Plombieres in contrast to **Source B** which is clearly a statement of Napoleon's interpretation of the same. **Source A** depicts France as altruistic, taking a lead in proposing strategy, in part because Cavour wants to convince the King that a French alliance was a good thing whilst in **Source B** there is a hint of reservation on Napoleon's part, perhaps accounted for by concern that France should not be portrayed as an aggressor or trouble-maker and to clearly point to French national interest. This point could be developed by consideration of the context of the sources. At Plombieres both the Piedmontese and the French were able to vent their hopes and expectations which might account for the more positive tone of **Source A**. However, by February 1859 a formal treaty had been signed and there is some evidence that despite this Napoleon was less convinced of the commitment he had made earlier – had he been too supportive of Piedmont's ambitions? Furthermore, the secrecy of the letter written by Cavour helps explain its frankness and the details made explicit in its content which candidates could verify if trying to assess the reliability of the source. On the other hand Napoleon was responding to rumours of war which helps account for the defensive attitude adopted in **Source B** and his concern to reassure Victoria and calm public fears. A judgement on the two sources as evidence is likely to weigh such issues and may conclude either that Cavour's private frankness gives a more accurate view of French intention or that it is less reliable given its purpose to convince the King. Napoleon may be the better source given what later happened but no set judgement is expected.

- (b) **Study all the Sources.**
Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the creation of the Kingdom of North Italy was due mainly to the support of France. [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 **importance of French support** is highlighted in **A, B and C with part of E** commenting ruefully on the price of such support. The **opposing view**, that Piedmontese and Italian efforts were of greater importance, are stressed in **D and E, with some support in C** depending on interpretation. However **D** could be seen in two different lights – the importance of Piedmontese initiative in the Central Duchies or the limitations imposed by the need to retain French support.

A strong case can be made in **support of the interpretation**. Most candidates are likely to argue that **Sources A and B**, in so far as they confirm the commitment France made to provide military assistance to Piedmont and concern for the diplomatic consequences in the event of war with Austria, indicate that French support was important. The fact that **Source E** acknowledges the ‘services she has rendered’ with the gift of Savoy and Nice re-enforces the point. Those familiar with the context should be able to explain that this concession was one of the terms of the Pact of Plombieres to which France was entitled so long as the Kingdom of Central Italy was established. As a group of three **Sources A, B and C** suggest French support was important diplomatically, at least. Candidates might evaluate **Source A** as a case of Cavour tapping the good will established with France at the Peace of Paris after the Crimean War and some might accept Cavour’s interpretation of Napoleon’s enthusiasm for the Italian cause as consistent with the latter’s support in his youth for the Carbonari and Italian nationalism. Napoleon’s less than enthusiastic tone in **Source B** might be explained as a result of the passage of time since Plombieres and the fact that the agreement was no longer secret which, together with ‘rumours of war’, raised tensions that alarmed Napoleon.

However, candidates might argue that French support, in this sense, was theoretical only and of secondary significance to the actions undertaken during the war with Austria and its immediate aftermath. Indeed, candidates might emphasise the reluctance of the French to commit themselves unless the international situation was favourable as implied in **Sources A and B**. Knowledge of the sensitivity of Anglo-French relations would be helpful. Further, some might refer to the Orsini bomb plot without which Napoleon might not have committed himself. In addition, the hesitation expressed by Napoleon in **Source B** could be substantiated with knowledge of Napoleon’s call for a Congress to discuss Italian affairs to diffuse the chances of war. Even Victor Emmanuel’s concession in **Source E** might be explained as a necessary gesture to ensure the Kingdom of North Italy enjoyed good relations with her neighbour rather than a sincere act of gratitude. The King was in a position to make such gestures as the creation of the Kingdom had been achieved by this date.

In assessing French support further, candidates may interpret **Source C** one way or the other. Some candidates may think the cartoonist is accusing Napoleon of inactivity, and certainly duplicity, with the burden for the war effort shouldered by Piedmont and implied concern as to what France would get out of it. Those who do may evaluate the cartoon as reflective of English hostility to Napoleon (seen as a comic mountebank) or stress the slowness of the French in reacting to the declaration of war, which this source in June suggests. On the other hand some candidates will consider the cartoon as indicative of the necessity of French support

for the Italian cause as the Piedmontese are seen to struggle alone. Victories at Magenta and Solferino were, in fact, only achieved by French military support. **Source D** is likely to be regarded as proof of the importance of Piedmontese initiatives in central Italy and the limitations of French support (the annexation of Tuscany is an example) especially as the author's comments appear to imply that the French have been sidelined there and contain, from the French Foreign Minister, an implied warning on the Villafranca agreement in relation to the Central Duchies (a restoration of their monarchs). French concerns about instability spreading into the Papal States might be used to evaluate Walewski's perspective and the limitations of French help. French concerns for the security of the Papal States might be discussed with particular reference to the importance of French public opinion on the sovereignty of the Pope. In **Source E** the King claims success was due to 'our heroes' and the 'courage of its inhabitants' (of the Central Duchies) crediting Italians rather than the French whose 'services' are not defined. However, politically it was in the interests of Victor Emanuel, addressing Italian politicians, to make such a 'Risorgimento' pitch. Some may even comment that **Sources A** and **B** concede that the initiative for starting war lay not with France but the Austrians who were goaded into aggression by Piedmontese manoeuvres on their border. The French sources (Napoleon and Walewski) stress the importance of diplomacy and agreements as statements of policy but they do not hide the French military commitment. The Piedmontese sources (Cavour and Victor Emmanuel) stress the role of Cavour's diplomacy and Italian heroes whilst acknowledging French support. They are concerned to spin events and may seek to 'pigeon hole' French support. Judgements will vary but are likely to conclude that French support was very significant indeed.

3 (a) Study Sources D and E

Compare these Sources as evidence for reaction to the election of Lincoln as President. [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 **differences**. Overall, **Source D** advocates a passive response because 'Mr Lincoln's party will not have the power' in contrast to **Source E** which recommends a pro-active approach to 'redress wrongs'. **Source D** is prepared to accept Lincoln and the Union whilst **Source E** 'looks to secession'. The basis of these positions is explained. The confidence of **Source D** is based on 'existing laws' which should 'be retained' and that they are enough in themselves as 'no additional legislation' is required. **Source E** is not so sanguine implying some laws, at least, are unacceptable specifically 'laws hitherto passed by the Abolition States' but goes further to suggest more fundamental 'amendments to the Constitution' are needed. There is scope for candidates to identify particular laws alluded to. A major difference is that **Source D** urges the Southern States to act in concert whereas **Source E** is prepared for Georgia to act alone.

The sharp contrast in the sources can be evaluated if the authorship and dates of the evidence are assessed. Douglas, in **Source D**, had argued for the Union in the election campaign and he was a convinced constitutionalist. He was obliged, therefore, to stand true to the principles he had espoused throughout his career and in the recent election campaign. On the other hand, Toombs, in **Source E**, was a strong advocate of Southern rights whose priority was the defence of their vested interests. Given that **Source D** was written only one week after his defeat in the election Douglas did not wish to be mean-spirited and his rivalry with Lincoln over many years was based on mutual respect. By contrast the views expressed in **Source E** are typical of Southerners who regarded Lincoln as a threat to their interests. When these considerations are weighed in conjunction with the purpose of each letter the obvious contrast between the sources is made clearer yet. In **Source D** Douglas is trying to calm fears aware that 'revolution' was a possible result of the election. Toombs, in **Source E**, seems close to confirming the validity of Douglas' concerns as he effectively insists on a deadline of March 4 (1861), when Lincoln was to be inaugurated, as the date by which the South should have gained satisfaction. Indeed, this demand is effectively an ultimatum as the last sentence is almost a call to arms. Some may comment on the privacy of letters and, therefore, the sincerity of their content, missing the point that they were intended to be made known to the public. As such, each represents the pitch the authors wished to present to the public for the motives suggested above. Both are pitched to the South and, given their respective slants, candidates may **judge** them of equal utility given the polarisation of views following Lincoln's election.

3 (b) Study all the Sources

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Lincoln intended to end slavery. [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. **Sources A, C and E** could be seen as indicating Lincoln's desire for abolition, whilst **Source B and a different reading of Sources A, C and D**, might suggest otherwise.

The evidence for the interpretation is considerable. **Source E** stands out as the most trenchant in claiming that Lincoln intended to end slavery. It asserts it was Lincoln's 'avowed object' to 'abolish slavery'. The tone of the piece is pessimistic anticipating drastic measures such as 'secession for redress', at least unless adequate safeguards are in place before Lincoln's inauguration. March 4th is presented as doomsday for southern interests. In evaluating the source candidates may reiterate points indicated in the mark scheme for the previous question. In addition, the seriousness of the situation could be demonstrated by the imminence of the secession of South Carolina only a week later and the same action taken by Georgia the following month. Or, comments on the sharp political divide made clear by the election results might be assessed.

Many candidates might suggest Toombs' views to be warranted given Lincoln's comments in **Source A**. At one level Lincoln seems to be in favour of ending slavery as he considers various options including removing slaves to Liberia, giving them equal rights or gradual emancipation. However, he also acknowledges the practical difficulties involved, not least 'the reluctance of our brethren in the South'. In addition, he reveals personal reservations of principle regarding the rights of slaves. Even if candidates see **Source A** as evidence for the interpretation they may explain his frankness on the subject as partly because of the occasion on which he was speaking (it was not a political rally) and the fact that he was a relatively minor figure in 1854.

The cartoon (**Source C**) may be seen as supporting the view that Lincoln intended to end slavery. After all, Lincoln is seen carrying a slave from one side of the Falls to the other (representative of the freedom gained by crossing from US to Canada?). His commitment to free the slaves was such that he was prepared to put himself in danger as the precariousness of the tightrope walk indicates with the whirlpool awaiting him. Some may point to the balancing rod as indicating that any move to end slavery would be done according to the Constitution but which, nonetheless, confirms Lincoln's intentions. Given the support of the magazine for Douglas in the election campaign such an assessment would be reasonable. On the other hand some may see the slave as simply indicative of the weight on Lincoln's shoulders and the divisive nature of slavery in the election campaign rather than as proof of his intentions. Indeed, some may suggest that the cartoon merely presents a viewpoint about Lincoln wishing to end slavery, which may lack validity.

This point could be emphasised by linking with **Source D**. Lincoln's rival accepts that many believed that Lincoln intended to end slavery but makes it clear that he did not regard this as likely because of the political reality. Indeed, Douglas' reference 'to those determined to maintain the Union' clearly applied to Lincoln for whom the preservation of the Union was his priority as Douglas was aware. **Source D**, therefore, could be said to argue against the interpretation. This point could be substantiated by analysis of **Source B**. It confirms Lincoln's position on the Union

and his view that slavery should be contained with no indication that he intended to end it. The allusions to the Fugitive Slave Law and States rights as well as the references to the Missouri Compromise and his preference for 'toleration' are consistent with this position. There is scope for candidates to explain the history Lincoln refers to. Given that Lincoln's comments were addressed to friends it would not be unreasonable to argue they are a reliable indication of Lincoln's intentions on the slavery question.

Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-63

4 (a) Study Sources A and B.

Compare these Sources as evidence for views concerning the economic policies in the German zones. [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 that they both assert that they want economic reform to unite Germany and to work in the interests of the German people. Both appear committed to a view of maintaining German unity, both economic and otherwise. **Byrnes in A** talks of Germany and 'maximum unification'; **Sokolovsky in B** similarly talks of the German people as an economic unit. The American view in **Source A** makes it clear that the US is determined to proceed with reform, even if it only has the support of the British, and that the ultimate aim is unification as far as possible. Both Sources agree that four-power agreement on economic policies is unlikely. The Soviet view is that the western powers do not really want general agreement and are determined to split Germany in the interests of a capitalist economic structure based on the dollar. The tone of **Source A** suggests that if they were unable to secure an all German economic zone they would go it alone.

The Sources also **differ**, not least on what the interests of the German people were. **Byrnes in A** assumes that trade needed to be restored as quickly as possible and would be fostered by economic standardisation on the US model, whereas **Sokolovsky in B** disagrees and thinks that the US forging ahead would restrict inter zonal trade by creating separate currencies. Sokolovsky makes a different argument based on the Potsdam Agreement and points out that the economic unification extolled by **Source A** will be impossible with the introduction of currency reforms in the western zones and he outlines the likely impact of the proposals. His point is that the US and Britain would be in breach of Potsdam if they proceeded alone. Beyond reiterating that the aim is economic unification, **Source A** gives little detail whereas **B** does spell out the implications and suggests that US motives constituted a form of economic imperialism – that they were using the failure to agree on currency reform as an 'excuse' to introduce US economic forms.

The **provenance** and **context** of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both are public pronouncements of policy, US and Soviet. Both are seeking to wrong-foot the other and win support both internationally and within Germany in their own zones. **Byrnes in A** also refers to British policy and, as he fails to refer to the French, one may infer that they too are reluctant in 1946 to merge their zone economically with the US and British sectors. **Source A** dates from some time before the emergence of the currency crisis and so takes a vaguer view. It also reflects the firmer attitude which Truman, as opposed to Roosevelt, took over Germany, as would be expected from his Secretary of State. The Secretary of State's involvement shows how seriously the US took the issue. The Soviet representative may have been of a lower status, a Soviet Marshal, a military man rather than a diplomat, but it still reflects the view of his superior, Stalin, quite fully and reveals the suspicion of US motives in economic reforms which characterised Soviet policy in this period plus the dogged sticking to the letter of the Potsdam agreements – that there should be four power agreement on everything. This effectively gave a veto to the Soviets on any move to solve Germany's acute economic problems. **Sokolovsky in B** is writing in June 1948, when the Soviets had

begun to blockade West Berlin. He studiously ignores this and instead focuses on US currency machinations, the occasion of Soviet action over West Berlin. Both sources are good examples of the outlook of the Great Powers.

A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. Candidates may feel that the detail in **B** and the fact that its predictions were largely fulfilled mean it carries greater weight as evidence for the development of economic policies in the various zones but its silence on the key contextual issue of June 1948, the Blockade, may render its views less creditable to some. 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 the occupying powers acted in German interests from 1945 to 1949. [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 powers did act in German interests (independence, unity, democracy, the restoration of some sort of economic normalcy and a measure of self government), is found in most of the Sources but from different perspectives, **A and C** from a western one, **B and D** a Soviet one. All four pay lip service to the idea of acting in German interests. The Soviet sources **B and D** approach such issues from a different ideological standpoint – that democracy meant communist rule as being most representative of the people, and that economic revolution was required to redistribute the means of production. The **supporting** view is explained in most of the Sources as they are public views inevitably arguing that the interests of Germany were paramount. **Source B** for example argues, from a Soviet perspective, that US sponsored currency reform is against the interests of the German people and only the USSR is acting in the interests of the German people. **Source C**, the new Federal Chancellor, refers to the German people being saved from starvation and brought back to limited self government. **Source D** focuses on the restoration of sovereignty in the GDR but then refers to an undemocratic West of warmongers, capitalists and landowners. **Source E** asserts that the breaking of the Berlin Blockade *with flying colours* was in German interests.

The **opposing** view, where there is a difference of opinion as to what those interests actually were, is largely expressed in **Sources B, C, D and E**, although the Soviet view in **B and D** particularly argues that German interests were being betrayed by the western occupying powers. Candidates may mention that the context is catastrophic and total defeat (**Source C**) and, at Potsdam, an element of dismemberment, military occupation, division, Nazi purging and, in the Soviet sectors, reparations. The **opposing** view is more strongly presented, as **Sources A and C** take the view, given the reality of the situation, that western recognition of a divided Germany, coupled with economic reform in the their zones was the best the western powers could do. Candidates might suggest that the US was concerned with its own interests in **Source A**, as much as with Germany, and explain why (the emerging Cold War and the restoration of free markets in Europe). **Source B** argues that western currency reform was against the interests of the German people and would lead to a division of Germany whilst **Source D** refers to a western occupation based on perpetual dependence, although it is clearly a highly slanted account. In **Source C** Adenauer waxes eloquently about the way the allies had rescued Germany from the aftermath of the war but he also comments that it was ‘only step by step’ that ‘limited

power' was returned to Germans. The implication is both that the Western powers dragged their feet and the Soviet occupying forces had not been involved so helpfully. The democratic process had only gradually been reinstated in the new Federal Republic and the Berlin Airlift saved the western sectors of the city from starvation but the eastern sector was abandoned to Soviet domination. Only part of Germany had begun the reconstruction process. Again candidates might feel that the allied powers received some benefit here too. Despite their obvious generosity over Marshal Aid and Berlin, they could not afford to lose face by doing nothing and **Source E** acknowledges the role played by NATO. **Source E** also comments that German leaders were reluctant to accept Germany's de facto division.

On the other hand, **Sources B** and **D** from Soviet authors take the view that the true interests of Germany are only to be served by their proposals. In **Source B** this means resisting the currency reforms the western powers wanted to introduce, on the grounds that trade will be ruined. In **Source D** criticism of the western powers is even stronger and they are seen as keeping reactionary groups in power in Germany, with a hint that these are closely linked to the old Third Reich. This is argued to be bad for Germany – 'enduring occupation and economic dependence'. The GDR, on the other hand is a model of democracy and freedom. Candidates might wish to challenge this view or explain how the Soviets could argue it. **Source E** suggests that German interests were not fully met as unification remained a distant dream and, after the threat to Berlin, German statesmen gave up trying to achieve it. This Source blames the Soviet occupying power who responded in kind.

The **provenance** and **context** of the Sources should be integrated into the discussion. Candidates can use their knowledge of life in Germany under the respective occupying powers to assess how far German interests were met and may well conclude that, however much lip service was paid to the ideal, the occupying powers often acted more in their own wider interests. As **Sources A** and **C** come from Western sympathisers and **Sources B** and **D** have a Soviet origin, candidates should be able to assess their interpretations in this light. **Norman Davies in E** comes from an immediate post Cold War perspective and clearly takes a western viewpoint, whilst acknowledging that some German hopes and interests were dashed.

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 Escalation of the Vietnam War 1965

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

Compare these Sources as evidence for problems the USA might face in increasing its military presence in Vietnam in 1965. [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 that they agree that US troops would find it difficult to fight in the terrain and climate - in **Source B** in 'hostile countryside', in **Source C** the weather and an unfamiliar battlefield. **Knowledge** of jungle v. conventional warfare might be used to develop this point. Both foresee US escalation causing America to be bogged down in a lengthy war - 'an irreversible process' - with hundreds of thousands of troops deployed and heavy US casualties. **Source B** suggests that escalation will expose the USA to be fighting some of its own allies, the South Vietnamese, perhaps implicitly supporting **Source C**, which suggests that the American people and US allies will withdraw their support. Contextual knowledge of US public opinion and international diplomacy might be used in evaluation of this point. Ball, in **Source B**, argues that the only option is withdrawal, to avoid fighting a North Vietnamese state backed by Chinese and Soviet resources. Though **Source C** agrees that the USA would risk the suicidal danger of a nuclear war with the USSR, it makes no mention of China. Ball in **B** focuses on military and diplomatic problems. Le Duan in **Source C** also mentions US domestic support and loss of markets – a wider view of the impact than that in **Source B**.

The Sources are also **different**. **Source C** suggests that the loss of international markets and the difficulty of maintaining global supply networks may cause some Americans to fear escalating the US military presence. **Knowledge**, e.g. of US commitments in Europe, might be used in evaluation of this point.

The **provenance** of the Sources should be cross-referenced in evaluation of these problems. Whereas the tone of **Source C** is positive, that of **Source B** is rather defeatist. The purpose of **Source C** is to encourage the Southern Communists to maintain morale, so it will not mention negative impact. George Ball, on the other hand, was the most prominent 'dove' in the State Department who represented one wing of the views in Washington. His memo is a subjective warning which was not heeded by Johnson, though the President himself agonised over committing ground troops and opted for a bombing campaign. This would lead to the problem Le Duan mentions in **Source C** of 'broadening the war in the South and North' meaning that the USA would find itself fighting some of the very people it had come to help. The nature of **Source B** is secret, and Ball's opposition to the Vietnam War only became public in 1971 when the Pentagon Papers were released. **Source C** is an open speech to a supportive audience to gain support for a protracted war, so it may be exaggerating US problems to underplay the likelihood that they will pose a serious threat, in the context of the attack on Pleiku and danger to US prestige.

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 in 1965 the USA had more to gain than to lose from escalating its military presence in Vietnam.

[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 the USA had more to gain than to lose by military escalation in 1965 appears in **Sources A, D, and E**. The argument against the interpretation appears in **Sources B and C**, which argue that the USA had much to lose in escalating the war and to some extent in **Source E** where fears of World War III underlay Johnson's approval of only limited escalation.

The argument in support of the interpretation is in **A, D, and E**. **Sources D and E** see escalation as a means of strengthening South Vietnam and pressuring the North. Bundy, in **Source A**, implies that the South Vietnamese regime is too weak to conduct the war and escalation might allow the USA to replace it. Johnson, in **Source E**, sees escalation as a way of assuring South Vietnam of the deep US commitment to the war, to encourage the regime there to end its corruption. Similarly, in **Source D**, McNamara sees escalation as a means of gaining respite from Viet Cong activity to allow the South to establish a reconstruction programme. **Knowledge** of Thieu's regime, ARVN weakness and Viet Cong strength might be used to evaluate this view. In **Source E**, Johnson sees escalation as a stick to force the North Vietnamese to stop their aggression against the South. **Source D** agrees, implying that destruction of the North-backed Viet Cong and the securing of the South, can only be assured by US military escalation. **Source A** confirms this, as the situation is deteriorating so that without escalation 'defeat seems inevitable'. **Source A** adds that the attack on the US base at Pleiku has offered an opportunity to turn the war around, which might be achieved by military escalation and reprisals. In contrast, Johnson, in **Source E** suggests controlled escalation and bombings might bring the North to the negotiating table, and hopes the gradual nature of the escalation will allow time to scale down should China retaliate. **Knowledge** of Chinese support for North Vietnam and the international situation in Asia might be used in evaluation.

The Sources also support the argument against the interpretation. **Sources B and C** argue that US troops would be unlikely to beat the Vietnamese communists, will suffer heavy casualties and lose support if they escalate. **Source C** argues that the USA will lose support from the US public and US allies if they fight the communist South Vietnamese, and suggests the climate, terrain and overstretched supply lines will lead to US failure and the loss of markets. Both Sources suggest that escalation will change the nature of the war from a civil war to part of a wider Cold War, limiting US actions for fear of Mutually Assured Destruction. **Knowledge** of the Cold War context and public opinion might be used in evaluation, perhaps linking to Johnson's views, in **Source E**, on avoiding World War III.

The **provenance** of the grouped Sources should be integrated into the evaluation of their reliability. All the Sources are subjective, so of limited reliability. **Sources A and D** are written by leading 'hawks' within Johnson's administration - Bundy as the prime mover in escalating the war and McNamara as Johnson's most influential adviser. Knowledge of Joint Chiefs of Staff views might be used to develop this point.

In **Source A**, Bundy states that the US team sent with him to Vietnam agree with his views, but we only have his word for it. Ball, in **Source B**, takes the stance of a 'dove' and aims to warn and restrain, while Le Duan, in **Source C**, aims to strengthen communist morale and play down the US threat. Johnson, in **Source E** is writing memoirs with hindsight, having seen the results of his policy and become disillusioned. The focus of knowledge should be primarily on the date set rather than on later events. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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



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

© OCR 2011