

28 November 2011 – 11 December 2011

A2 GCE HISTORY B

F986 Historical Controversies – Non-British History

Candidates answer on the Answer Booklet.

OCR supplied materials:

- 16 page Answer Booklet
(sent with general stationery)

Other materials required:

None

Duration: 3 hours



INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

- Write your name, centre number and candidate number in the spaces provided on the Answer Booklet. Please write clearly and in capital letters.
- Use black ink.
- Answer **both sub-questions** from **one** Study Topic.
- Read each question carefully. Make sure you know what you have to do before starting your answer.
- Do **not** write in the bar codes.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

- The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.
- The total number of marks for this paper is **60**.
- This paper contains questions on the following 4 Study Topics:
 - Different Approaches to the Crusades, 1095–1272
 - Different Interpretations of Witch-hunting in Early Modern Europe c.1560–c.1660
 - Different American Wests 1840–1900
 - Debates about the Holocaust
- You should write in continuous prose and are reminded of the need for clear and accurate writing, including structure and argument, grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- The time permitted allows for reading the Extract in the one Option you have studied.
- In answering these questions, you are expected to use your knowledge of the topic to help you understand and interpret the Extract as well as to inform your answers.
- **You may refer to your class notes and textbooks during the examination.**
- This document consists of **8** pages. Any blank pages are indicated.

1 Different approaches to the Crusades 1095–1272

Read the following extract about the Crusades and then answer the questions that follow.

The most striking results of the Crusades were the first European colonies outside of the continent of Europe. At this point in time the Crusades began a chapter of European expansion and foreshadowed all later colonial movements. Unlike previous colonizing movements the Crusades did not have anything in common culturally with the lands that they conquered. They were the bearers of a common European cultural heritage. They belonged to a Western branch of the Church, were brought up in the same traditions, lived in a world of identical concepts and attitudes, and their social order was based on the same belief system. It is no accident that to the Moslems 'al-Franj' meant Europeans, but to the Christian chroniclers of the Crusades Franks meant the European conquerors in the East.

Viewed from the perspective of colonial history a basic distinction must be made between the First Crusade and all subsequent migrations, whether or not called Crusades. Here we refer to the mass character of the First Crusade, when tens of thousands left Europe and moved to the new lands in the East. None of the following Crusades or peaceful movements of people from Europe inbetween the military expeditions ever had the same character. Not less striking is the fact that the First Crusade was almost entirely unprepared. No earlier, smaller attempts preceded it. There was no test expedition, no overall planning or adventurers going ahead of the crusade which others could follow. To the amazed chroniclers it looked like a mass exodus from Europe and this seems the right expression in more than one sense for the great masses moved by religious belief. This does not exclude the fact that everyone had his private little hope, a vision of riches or other form of gain. Nevertheless, the First Crusade was driven by the total sum of such expectations, ideology, religion and an urge for material gain. So many would abandon their normal, if not overly rich, lives in Europe to dive into an expedition into the unknown. All later crusades were very different, the later crusaders knew something about the land they were travelling to and the possible risks of their actions could be weighed against the potential advantages. Thus, in its mass character the First Crusade differs basically from any other movement of expansion and colonization.

Europe came of age at the end of the eleventh century. The historical threads of the preceding five hundred years met in a pattern in which the feature of modern times can already be seen. In the following five hundred years a Europe bursting with energy would spread over the globe spreading its peoples, institutions and culture.

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation, approaches and methods of the historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer. **[30]**
- (b) Some historians have focused on the role of the Papacy in the Crusades. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of the Crusades. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings? **[30]**

2 Different Interpretations of Witch-hunting in Early Modern Europe c.1560–c.1660

Read the following extract about witch-hunting and then answer the questions that follow.

The witch-craze of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries must be seen both in its social and in its intellectual context. It cannot properly be seen, as the nineteenth-century liberal historians tended to see it, as mere 'delusion', detached from the social and intellectual structure of the time.

In the mid-sixteenth century, the witch-craze was revived and extended. It seems obvious that the cause of this revival was the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, and the renewed enthusiasm of the rival Churches. The great leaders of the Reformation, as of the Counter-Reformation, were essentially conservative; and they served far more of the medieval tradition than they would willingly admit. Demonology, an extension of medieval cosmology, was defended. It, like the science of which it was a part, was a common inheritance which could not be denied by such conservative Reformers. It lay deeper than the superficial disputes about religious practices.

The Protestant clergy set out to recover their faith. Sometimes they found opposition. Sometimes this opposition could be described as 'popery'. 'The Devil, the Mass and witches' were lumped together. Dissidents were witches. With the Catholic reconquest a generation later, the same pattern repeats itself. The Catholic missionaries discover obstinate resistance. They too find it in particular areas: in Languedoc, in the Vosges and the Jura, in the Rhineland, the German Alps. They too describe it as Protestant heresy, now as witchcraft. The two terms are sometimes interchangeable.

Such is the progress of the witch-craze as a social movement. But it is not only a social movement. It can be extended deliberately, in times of political crisis, as a political weapon, to destroy powerful enemies or dangerous persons. It can also be extended in times of panic by its own momentum. When a 'great fear' takes hold of society we see the persecution extended from old women to educated judges and clergy whose crime is to have resisted the craze.

Finally, the stereotype, once established, creates its own folk-lore, which becomes in itself a centralizing force. If that folk-lore had not already existed, if it had not already been created by social fear out of popular superstition, then psychopathic persons would have attached their sexual hallucinations to other, perhaps more individual, figures. But once the folk-lore had been created and had been impressed by the clergy upon every mind, it served as a psychological as well as a social stereotype. The Devil with his nightly visits became real to hysterical women in a harsh rural world or in artificial communities – in ill-regulated nunneries as at Marseilles or in special regions like the Pays de Labourd, where the fishermen's wives were left deserted for months.

A strong central government could control the craze while popular liberty often let it run wild. The centralized Inquisition in Spain or Italy, by monopolizing persecution, limited the spread of the witch-craze. However, north of the Alps the free competition of bishops, abbots and petty lords, each with his own jurisdiction, ensured the burnings continued.

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation, approaches and methods of the historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer. **[30]**
- (b) In their work on witch-hunting some historians have used a Marxist approach. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of witch-hunting. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings? **[30]**

3

Different American Wests 1840–1900

Read the following extract about the American West and then answer the questions that follow.

Those who argue that the treatment of the American Indian in the West constituted an example of genocide stress the severity, speed, brutalism and wholesale nature of the assault. From a pre-contact estimate of five million, the American Indian population in 1894 stood at a mere 237,000. Five hundred nations, all with separate traditions, languages and practices, were comprehensively decimated.

In the culture of the nineteenth century, the construction of the American Indian as doomed savage served to encourage genocide. In defining indigenous populations as useless and subhuman, journalists, missionary fathers, civic authorities and military commanders were using ‘a language of extermination’. Exclusion and prejudice identified American Indians as a target group for abuse and earned them associations with depravity and inferiority. Racialised codes encouraged among settlers the notion of Indians as bloodthirsty, primitive and uniformly warlike. This encouraged seeing indigenous tribes as hostile ‘others’ and enemies of the state deserving of eradication. In Humboldt County (1860) and Rogue River (1855) residents enthusiastically took up arms to massacre local Indians, while sport hunting of Apaches in the south-west became one occupation for settlers fuelled by gold-fever, racism and land-hunger.

Situated in the context of continental expansion and westward expansion, genocide represented a tool of empire, and an efficient method to advance the Euro-American project in the West. Even without open declarations to exterminate, the need to ‘win the West’ provided a practical authorisation for genocide. Anecdotal evidence even suggested that blankets infected with smallpox were deliberately passed to tribes on the Missouri in the 1830s with ‘biological warfare’ perceived as an easy and convenient route to achieve subjection of the Indians.

Presented as exploration, expansion and settlement, the mechanics of nation-building, capitalism and Christianity provided the apparatus and justification for extermination. Indians were obstacles to progress. Manifest Destiny matched all the tainted associations of the Nazi ideas of racial superiority. According to M Annette Jaimes, ‘Nazi Germany and the United States did what they did for virtually identical reasons.’

The massacre at Sand Creek is a striking illustration of a West marked by atrocity. In Denver, residents fired up with frontier fury hailed the ‘battle’ (as it was first reported) as a worthy revenge for attacks on wagon trains and settler farms. President Theodore Roosevelt characterised the event ‘as righteous and beneficial a deed as ever took place on the frontier’.

In 2000, the National Park Service authorised the creation of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site. Unsurprisingly, the dedication ceremony of 28 April 2007 steered well clear of the term ‘genocide’, although Senator Sam Brownback offered an official apology: ‘I acknowledge and admit wrongs were done by the federal government here and across the nation.’

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation, approaches and methods of the historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer. **[30]**
- (b) In their work on the American West some historians have focused on the industrial and urban West. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of the American West. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings? **[30]**

Debates about the Holocaust

Read the following extract about the Holocaust and then answer the questions that follow.

During his trial in Jerusalem in 1961 for war crimes, Eichmann claimed that the most potent factor in the soothing of his own conscience was the simple fact that he could see no one, no one at all, who actually was against the Final Solution. He expected – and received, to a truly extraordinary degree – the cooperation of the Jews. This was ‘of course the very cornerstone’ of everything he did. Without Jewish help in administrative and police work – the final rounding up of Jews in Berlin was done entirely by Jewish police – there would have been either complete chaos or an impossibly severe drain on German manpower.

To a Jew this role of the Jewish leaders in the destruction of their own people is undoubtedly the darkest chapter of the whole dark story. It has been known about before, but it has now been exposed for the first time in all its pathetic and sordid detail by Raul Hilberg, in his standard work ‘The Destruction of the European Jews’.

In Amsterdam as in Warsaw, in Berlin as in Budapest, Jewish officials could be trusted to compile lists of persons and of their property, to secure money from the deportees to defray the expenses of their deportation and extermination, to help seize Jews and get them on trains, until, as a last gesture, they handed over the assets of the Jewish community in good order for final confiscation. They distributed the Yellow Star badges, and sometimes, as in Warsaw, ‘the sale of the armbands became a regular business; there were ordinary armbands of cloth and fancy armbands which were washable.’ In the Nazi-inspired, but not Nazi-dictated, manifestoes they issued, we still can sense how they enjoyed their new power – ‘The Central Jewish Council has been granted the right of absolute disposal over all Jewish spiritual and material wealth and over all Jewish manpower’ as the first announcement of the Budapest Council phrased it.

That the prosecution in Jerusalem should have avoided bringing this chapter of the story into the open was almost a matter of course. It must be included here, however, because it accounts for a certain otherwise inexplicable gap in the documentation of a generally over-documented case. The judges mentioned one such instance, the absence of H G Adler’s book ‘Theresienstadt 1941–1945’, which the prosecution, in some embarrassment, admitted to be ‘authentic, based on irrefutable sources.’ The reason for the omission was clear. The book describes in detail how the feared ‘transport lists’ were put together by the Jewish Council of Theresienstadt.

The atmosphere, not of a show trial but of a mass meeting, at which speaker after speaker does his best to arouse the audience, was especially noticeable when the prosecution called witness after witness to testify to the rising in the Warsaw ghetto – a matter that had no connection whatever with the crimes of the accused. The testimony of these people would have contributed something to the trial if they had told of the activities of the Jewish Councils, which had played such a great and disastrous role in their own heroic efforts. While the legal irrelevance of all this very time-consuming testimony remained pitifully clear, the political intention of the Israeli government in introducing it was not difficult to guess. It probably wanted to demonstrate that whatever resistance there had been had come from Zionists, as though of all Jews, only the Zionists knew that if you could not save your life it might still be worth saving your honour.

I have dwelt on this chapter of the story, which the Jerusalem trial failed to put before the eyes of the world in its true dimensions, because it offers the most striking insight into the totality of the moral collapse the Nazis caused in respectable European society. This happened not only in Germany but in almost all countries occupied by the Nazis, not only among the persecutors, but also among the victims.

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation, approaches and methods of the historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer. **[30]**
- (b) In their study of the Holocaust, some historians have focused on minority groups other than the Jews. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of the Holocaust. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings? **[30]**

**Copyright Information**

OCR is committed to seeking permission to reproduce all third-party content that it uses in its assessment materials. OCR has attempted to identify and contact all copyright holders whose work is used in this paper. To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced in the OCR Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download from our public website (www.ocr.org.uk) after the live examination series.

If OCR has unwittingly failed to correctly acknowledge or clear any third-party content in this assessment material, OCR will be happy to correct its mistake at the earliest possible opportunity.

For queries or further information please contact the Copyright Team, First Floor, 9 Hills Road, Cambridge CB2 1GE.

OCR is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group; Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.