

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

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

Mark Scheme for January 2013

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

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2013

Subject-specific Marking Instructions**Question (a) Maximum mark 30**

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

Notes related to Part A:

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

Marking Grid for Question (a)

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Total for each question = 30	<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>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made. · Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue. · The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent. <p style="text-align: center;">9–10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both. · Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely. <p style="text-align: center;">10–12</p>
Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted. · A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence. · Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">7–8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it. · Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach. <p style="text-align: center;">8–9</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and/or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion. · Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding. · Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication. <p style="text-align: center;">5–6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit · Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation. <p style="text-align: center;">6–7</p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
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	A02a 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	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"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p style="text-align: center;">20–22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation. • Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer. <p style="text-align: center;">42–48</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p style="text-align: center;">17–19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent. • Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">35–41</p>

AOs	A01a 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	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question. · Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant. · Little organisation or structure with poor communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3–4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation. · A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content. · No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">7–13</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question. · No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context. · Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression. <p style="text-align: center;">0–2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive. · No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately. · No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince. <p style="text-align: center;">0–6</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)	<p>The context is immediate post war distress, specifically the winter of 1816/17 which saw the two Spa Fields Meetings, the second of which degenerated into violence and alleged revolutionary plotting. This brought into focus the issue of radical methods. Both sources agree that the focus should be parliamentary reform. They are similar in agreeing on moderate methods – ‘the superiority of mental over physical force’ by Hunt in Source A and the stress on ‘moderate methods’ by Cobbett in Source B. Both stress petitions as a primary method and both put great stress on Open Meetings. At these there could be a ‘calling aloud for timely reform’ in Source A, a trust in individual effort and open meetings in Source B.</p> <p>However there are important differences. Hunt in Source A argues that physical force could be resorted to if moderate methods failed. Cobbett does not. Cobbett, unlike Hunt disapproves of Political Clubs, plots and Corresponding Societies, considering them all ineffective. They also differ on the use of language. Cobbett in Source B stresses that language must be moderately used in both petitions and meetings. However Hunt in Source A indulges in rousing rhetoric that implies the right of rebellion. Thus he hints and warns about an ultimate recourse to violence and physical force. Candidates may note that his reference to the ‘fatal day’ was greeted by a ‘hurrah’ from the crowd. He himself will not be backward in coming forward.</p> <p>As regards provenance the dates and geography of the sources are important. Hunt is addressing a radical part of artisan London and he is aware that he must not go too far whilst using the mass platform to enthuse (‘the fatal day’). The meeting passed off peacefully. The second Spa Fields meeting on the 2nd December was hijacked by radical Spenceans and ended in a drunken riot. This led the government to clamp down in the Gagging Acts of 1817. This provides the different context for Cobbett, who is writing, in contrast, to a rural area advising more moderate and legal methods, such as petitions and open meetings. His purpose is to calm things and avoid giving the government any excuse to further move against the radicals, hence his more moderate tone.</p> <p>In judgement candidates may well see Hunt’s evidence in Source A as better for explaining and demonstrating the rhetoric of the mass platform and his particular form of crowd control. Cobbett in B is better for general tactics following the debacle of the 2nd Spa Fields Meeting, although his dislike of other radicals like Hunt may also colour his evidence.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for.....’</p> <p>The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Various views on the reasons for radical failure in this period are possible. The suggestion is that divisions within the radicals, both over personality and policy clashes and disagreement over tactics, rendered them weak and prone to failure, Sources B and D. The main alternative is that they were in fact relatively united and strong, both in purpose and in tactical ingenuity, and it was government strength and repression that ensured failure (Sources A, B, C and E). All the sources are from radicals, including the cartoon, and provide a variety of internal perspectives and on the problems that they faced in a society that restricted and denied them access to the franchise and parliament.</p> <p>The view that the radicals failed through their own divisions can be found in Sources B and D. Cobbett in Source B is contemptuous of the failure of Spa Fields and firmly holds to moderate methods. He dislikes radical Spenceans like Watson, and Thistlewood, whom he blames for Spa Fields and he would also include Hunt in this. However he also condemns Cartwright's Hampden Clubs, in contrast to Bamford in Source E. These were the major post Spa Fields initiative from the radicals to organise both locally and then move to a central organisation. Yet Cobbett considers them ineffective. However his evidence is tainted by his dislike of Hunt and Cartwright and by his own preference for local meetings, issues and his Political Register. Nonetheless its dislike of other radicals and their methods is corroborated by Hazlitt in Source D. Writing in 1819 in the context of Peterloo and from a detached perspective (he was a literary radical who was also a sought after journalist and writer) he is very explicit in his condemnation of radical divisions. He blames the personalities and leaders rather than their policies. He argues they all hated each other, took individual lines and devoted their respective organisations to undermining each other. Knowledge may bear this out. This was an age of self dependent politicians who found it difficult to create a central organisation, hence Carlyle's long contest with authority and Hunt's efforts to hog the limelight (as Source A and Peterloo illustrate). Place saw most other radicals as fools to be manipulated. Bamford became ever more moderate and was prone to self esteem, hence his grand autobiographical descriptions in 'Passages in the Life of a Radical', (Source E is an example in point). Carlyle despised organisation and consulting others. As Source D suggests the radicals were prima donnas demanding and rarely getting respect from each other. They liked slogans and political theatre (the platform and grand entrances to towns and cities). Whilst this and their demagoguery could rouse numbers they were not always good leaders. As Hazlitt comments in Source D their parties and committees were often aimed more at each other than the government and authority. In Source A Hunt deals with emotion rather than strategy.</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>The sources can be read/analysed in different ways and as part of their judgement candidates will need to appreciate this.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The alternative view is that they were strong but failed because of government strength. This interpretation can be found in Sources A, B, C and E. Hunt in A is clearly a master of crowd manipulation and, like most of the leaders, good at staying just this side of the law in his rhetoric. His management of the 1st Spa Fields meeting is effective. Similarly Cobbett in B is careful not to provoke and provides evidence of considerable activity. However the main evidence of radical purpose and unity is Bamford in Source E. He comments on increased membership of the Hampden Clubs, good funding, the use of chapels for regular meetings and also signs of a national organisation emerging, a national Meeting or Convention in London. The aims (parliamentary reform) are clear – all over the age of 18 paying taxes are to vote annually and each block of population is to receive a representative with no corrupt placemen allowed. There appears to be unity at the base and in the localities, whatever the divisions at the top. The stalwarts were local trade unionists, booksellers and local speakers. This would suggest that the Cartoon in Source C is accurate and that, as Cobbett realised in Source B, the Government is repressive and proactive. The government should be given no excuse to act. The comment in C comes from March 1817, after the government clamp down following Spa Fields. The Gagging Acts had suspended habeas corpus, there were press restrictions and the law was being used to arrest and imprison radicals. A Committee of secrecy had been set up to collate evidence of widespread conspiracy and revolution, Lord Eldon’s large sack. Church and patronage were used to counter the radicals and the use of troops was more frequent (culminating in Peterloo). Spies were used to infiltrate and incriminate the radicals. The radicals were a ‘weeping’ and marginalised group. Although obviously exaggerated Source C points to government strength rather than radical weakness.</p> <p>The sources can be read/analysed in different ways and as part of their judgement candidates will need to appreciate this. As a set they are all radical, revealing elements both of strength and division.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>The context of both sources are Gladstone's campaigns in late 1879 and 1880, the first Midlothian campaign, dating from November/December 1879 when Gladstone accepted the nomination to be Liberal candidate for the normally solid Conservative constituency of Midlothian, the second being the result of the General Election that ensued in 1880. Gladstone's focus in both was a condemnation of Disraeli's foreign and imperial policy. Both sources are similar in agreeing on the power of Gladstone's mass oratory, using very similar language to describe its impact. The Times in B refers to a 'passionate temper'; Watson in C to the 'launching upon a sea of passion'. Both have occasion to question Gladstone's reasoning, albeit in rather different ways. The Times in B considers that such oratory lacks a sense of calm judgement and 'considered argument'; Watson in C, after the event, comments on a sense of 'ecstasy beyond reason'.</p> <p>However they differ on the impact of the campaigns. The Times tends to dismiss it as temporary and shallow, commanding only brief popular enthusiasm from the electorate, an electorate which it thinks is still dominated by the cautious and intelligent voter, not yet the mass democracy of post 1884. The emotion it thinks Gladstone wrongly whips up will evaporate quickly, having little (probably deleterious) impact on the thoughtful voting classes it thankfully thinks are still in a majority. The Times is confident that most will not surrender to Gladstone's public display of 'passionate temper'. In contrast Watson in Source C comments from the vantage point of a voter who did succumb and who appears both intelligent and perceptive in his comments. The Times in B misses the point that C makes about Gladstone's ability to empower people. It considers Gladstone's impact to be temporary –'for a while command'. Watson in C makes the point that Gladstone gave his audience a sense of power, putting decisions into the hands of people and nation. It was their 'verdict'. They would make the decisions. Gladstone, according to Watson, enabled people to understand complex issues as matters of simple and great principle, 'moral commands'. This effect is missed completely by the Times.</p> <p>As regards provenance the key lies in the respective positions of the two sources. The Times in B was the major 'establishment' newspaper commenting at the beginning of the 1st Midlothian campaign when the probable result of an ex Liberal leader challenging in a safe Conservative seat may well have appeared foolish and unlikely to succeed. It clearly disapproves of Gladstone's campaigning tactics. Such campaigns were relatively new and, if Bulgaria was anything to go by, likely to either fizzle out or work against Gladstone when events changed.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The Times' audience was a prosperous and educated Upper and Middle Class who followed politics through the word rather than the traditionally radical mass platform. They would, like the Times, disapprove of Gladstone's policies and tactics. In contrast Watson attended the 1880 meeting as part of a later General Election campaign when Gladstone was clearly at the height of his powers following many such events. His purpose is different – to describe the personal impact of Gladstone on himself as an audience member and to analyse what he described as being 'Gladstonised'. Although largely supportive of Gladstone's overall stance, he is careful to assess the precise impact of Gladstone on large crowds. He was writing in a political magazine and assessing his immediate reactions.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to judge that both sources are useful in demonstrating how Gladstone could polarise opinion. Both provide useful evidence for a differing impact. The Times is effective evidence for establishment distaste of Gladstone's popular campaigns, but Watson may be considered the better evidence as his account is from the perspective of Gladstone's audience and contains some balance. It is more careful in its analysis of Gladstone's play upon emotions and upon the popular reaction he was having. Contrary to the Times' opinion, Gladstone won the election of 1880.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The sources support two possible interpretations of Gladstone's campaigns. The view in the question is that he was reluctantly drawn out of retirement by a simple sense of moral outrage at Disraeli's irresponsibility over foreign and imperial issues (Bulgaria and the Eastern Question in 1876; Afghanistan and South Africa in 1879–80). The other view is that Gladstone as politically ambitious, using the campaigns as an excuse to stage a political comeback after the debacle of the 1874 election, reasserting his hold over Liberalism and sweeping aside his successors, the Whig Liberals Granville and Hartington, and potential future rivals, like the coming Joe Chamberlain.</p> <p>The sources represent a variety of views – Gladstone himself commenting in public and private both during and after the event; an intelligent observer of the campaigns themselves; an establishment view; and a modern historian. All the sources, except possibly E which suggests politics and ambition, are capable of supporting either interpretation, depending on how their information and provenance are assessed.</p> <p>The interpretation in the question, Gladstone returning out of a sense of duty and moral outrage to conduct a crusade against 'Beaconsfieldism', can be found in all the sources except E. As might be expected Gladstone in sources A and D is at pains, both privately (A) and publicly (D), to deny political ambition and stress instead his moral duty, responding to the pressures of both others and events. To Bright in A he cites five very cogent reasons why he is no longer ambitious. Nor does he think it realistic to challenge for the leadership. In particular he cites loyalty to Granville and Hartington and to the great hostility such ambition would produce (confirmed with reference to the views of the Times in B). Source D most clearly supports the view of a moral crusade. In his Reminiscences he stresses that he acted out of a moral sense of duty to the subject peoples of the Balkans. It was an act of public justice. However candidates could question the extent to which, by 1896, Gladstone was weaving a story about his career, one based on a series of moral missions, that of the 1870s being on Britain's European and World role. Certainly in D he argues for a reluctantly adopted mission, saying he was slow to see Disraeli's unconditional support for the Ottomans and was content to allow others (Forster) to take the lead in opposing him. The stress is on compulsion (from Bright?) and he explicitly states that he had no thought as to leadership. The Times in Source B doubts Gladstone's political ability, commenting unfavourably on his campaigns. It is convinced he will not succeed. Its reference to 'passionate temper' would suggest moral outrage on policies abroad rather than political ambition. Knowledge might suggest that the Liberal leadership was reluctant to</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>support him, not just because he was a threat to them but because his opinions would make it more difficult to come to a favourable resolution of Britain's foreign and imperial interests. Watson in C comments purely in terms of great principles, an appeal to the people, 'moral commands'. Shannon in E could be considered unduly cynical in his view, his Gladstone's 'game' quotation applying equally to a moral campaign as a political one.</p> <p>The alternative argument, for ambition is largely to be found in Sources A (reading between the lines), C (gaining votes), in part D and especially E. Although Gladstone in Source A, writing privately to his mentor Bright (who had raised the issue of his resuming the leadership), denies it, the fact that Bright mentions it meant that the Midlothian campaign was having a huge political impact. There was pressure from the radical wing for Gladstone to come out of retirement to challenge the Whig leadership over partial support for Disraeli's policies abroad. This is supported in Source E where Chamberlain hopes a return will discomfit the Whigs. Gladstone had to write to Bright to deny it. As he later commented, in Source D, of 1876 and Bulgaria, he was less than impressed with the existing leadership's reactions to Disraeli's government. Source C supports the passion that Gladstone aroused but, despite reservations, Watson votes for him in 1880. That sort of response made it impossible for the Whig leadership of the Liberals or the Queen, to hold out against his resumption of the premiership. Candidates may well spot the last sentence of Source A, where Gladstone changes his modest tack and comments on the 'wonderful enthusiasm' in Scotland. He shares his 'content' with Bright on the 'progress of popular opinion' and its response to the Midlothian campaign. One reading of this source is that Gladstone is rousing opinion in a way that Bright approves, with the leadership in mind, but is careful to reign in Bright and not appear to be queering Granville and Hartington's pitch as existing leaders. Commenting after the event, in Source D, Gladstone arguably continues to be ingenuous. On the one hand he comments on his re-emergence from 1876 (over the Eastern Question, Afghanistan and South Africa – the 'main business of my life'), implying simply an innocent reaction to events. However candidates might comment on the penultimate sentence – 'nevertheless it made me leader again whether I wanted it or not'. Was Gladstone commenting in a knowing manner, aware that his campaign was meant to deliver him the leadership, or is this simply a statement of innocent fact? Taken together the two Gladstonian sources, A and D, certainly show that leadership and ambition could be seen as the unwritten agenda of the campaigns, although the private/public aspects of both confirm that Gladstone was always careful on issues of ambition. Own knowledge might suggest that, at least on Bulgaria, Gladstone was reluctant to come forward. Public opinion</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>led him rather than the other way around, but by 1879 he had taken charge. Watson in C and Shannon in E both confirms Gladstone’s ability to arouse emotion, set agendas and win elections, (in this case 1880). Watson in C, despite some reservations, votes for him and confesses to be ‘Gladstonised’. He and Gladstone consider the victory of 1880 to be that of the nation, not the Whig and Tory upper classes, as Gladstone may have intended. If it is Gladstone who wins, it will inevitably be he who returns to both leadership and premiership. Candidates could use their knowledge to show how Gladstone overcame even the Queen’s objections to his resumption of the government. Given the balance of Watson’s comments he may be considered effective evidence of Gladstone’s political tenacity.</p> <p>Shannon in E, from a more modern and cynical perspective, quotes Gladstone himself in 1876 as evidence that a ‘game’ was afoot’, a game in which he was backed by formerly alienated Nonconformists and the rising radical star of Chamberlain. For Shannon the ‘abdication’ of 1875 was both a ‘fiction’ and short-lived (he re-emerged in 1876), Gladstone feeling only ‘slight embarrassment’ at pushing the Whigs aside in 1880 (in contrast to his protestations to Bright about the leadership in Source A). However candidates may feel that this ignores the seriousness of his intentions, his real commitment to retirement and only temporary re-emergence (?). He could also be quoting Gladstone out of context. The ‘game’ could merely refer to his campaign rather than a wider political agenda. A consideration of 1876–80 might stress Gladstone’s reluctance, at least in 1876–78 to embark on a crusade and his acceptance of the Midlothian liberal candidacy may have owed more to his desire to escape from Greenwich, scene of his 1874 humiliation, and to the traditional Rosebery interest in Midlothian than to a moral crusade that only developed once underway.</p> <p>In terms of judgement candidates may well consider the evidence for moral issues and ‘reluctance’ to be more compelling, given the framework of reference that all the sources adopt. However Gladstone’s views in A and D are, as always, politically careful and the consequence of both Bulgaria and Midlothian was to move Gladstone centre stage, enable him to take the credit for Liberal victory in 1880 and resume government and leadership without the qualms his comments to Bright in Source A suggest.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>These sources differ on several points. Source B accuses Labour MPs of failing to support unemployed textile workers in Manchester whereas Source D demonstrates the solidarity of local Labour politicians and local people in the march to the High Court. In Source B the charge against Labour is that they preferred to talk, 'empty and meaningless slogans at Liberal meetings' in contrast to the politicians of Poplar who were prepared to take action in pursuit of changing the rating system. This point could be extended by consideration of the leadership shown by Labour politicians. In Source B the Party is described as without 'teeth or claws' and with 'blind leaders'. However, in Source D the leaders of the council were prepared to go to jail and to remain defiant in prison by singing the Red Flag and Lansbury addressed their supporters from his 'cell window'. According to Source B Labour MPs were more concerned with temperance reform than 'the subject of unemployment'. However, the whole thrust of Source D indicates that the priority of the Labour Party in Poplar was to improve the lot of the poor and unemployed. In Source B MPs are said to 'have displayed greater activity for temperance reform' with the implication that some MPs regarded moral virtue as a remedy for poverty. This contrasts starkly with Source D which recognises clearly the imperative of financial matters to deal with the problems of the unemployed and they were prepared to flout their obligations to the LCC by withholding money from them.</p> <p>A very obvious but important point should be made to explain the differences. Source B is commenting on the Parliamentary Labour Party which was in 'alliance' with the Liberals who headed the government. As such they were not in a position to determine policy whereas the Labour Party was in control of the county council in Poplar with some scope to decide policy and an ability to rebel against the LCC, albeit at a cost. However, there is convergence of purpose between the authors of Sources B and D: they both want change. When Source B was written the Liberal Party was addressing a range of social problems and expectations of change were high and, although reforms for the working man were introduced later, there had not been any significant progress by 1908 which explains the frustration of the author of Source B. After World War One there was great pressure on government, even at local level, to create 'Homes for Heroes'. This helps explain the determination of the author of Source D to affect change from a Conservative dominated Coalition Government. Furthermore, the author was writing almost ten years after the rates row and perhaps exaggerates the role he and his colleagues played in reforming the rates. This could be linked to a broader point of motive. Lansbury was an ambitious Labour MP in 1928 and he may have been trying to enhance his reputation by writing his autobiography at this stage. Indeed, he assumed the leadership of the Party in 1931 and held the post till 1935.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The author of Source B was a frustrated radical hoping to stimulate or embarrass the Labour Party into action and he wanted to be entirely detached from the Liberals.</p> <p>In judgement on the evidence candidates might argue that a comparison of the Party at national and local level has its limitations especially as Lansbury was also an MP. Given the different personal motives of the authors some might argue that Source B was more reliable. Either way both sources show how the problem of unemployment was a major issue as far many in the Party were concerned and that there were differences within the Party in how to deal with it, and over political tactics in the different circumstances of 1908 and 1921.</p>		
(b)	<p>Sources that support the interpretation strongly are B and E, although Source C is weighted that way too. However, Source C also provides evidence to the contrary: even Source E can be used to challenge the interpretation. Sources A and D provide less ambiguous evidence to challenge the interpretation.</p> <p>Sources B and E both charge Labour with ‘betrayal’ (Source B) and ‘treachery’ (Source E) specifically of the working class but more generally of party principles. Source B sarcastically suggests ‘they have displayed greater activity for temperance reform than for Labour interests’ and Source E accuses the Labour Government of ‘wholesale scrapping of principles’. This is developed in Source B which suggests Labour MPs are more interested in playing at politics and attending Liberal meetings where they mouth ‘empty and meaningless slogans’ implying a willingness to compromise their principles. Source E damns the Labour Party as working in ‘the service of capitalism’ which explicitly suggests they have abandoned their principles. Source C could be integrated into this analysis as it is particularly critical of MacDonald who is thought to be ‘preparing his exit from the ILP’ and of ‘joining the Liberal Party’. Even the founder of the Party, Kier Hardie, is described as disillusioned ‘with no real faith left in the Labour movement as a revolutionary force’. It is implied that ‘the rank and file become more restive’ because they too are disillusioned. However, the authors of Sources B and C are of the radical wing of the Party and the author of Source E is from the Communist Party. As such the latter has a vested interest in painting the Labour Party as unprincipled and part of the establishment, ‘anxious to conserve the whole worn out fabric of Parliament’. He also ignores the fact that Mac Donald headed a minority government. The criticism of Tillett and Webb might be explained by virtue of being some of the early members of the Party and intellectuals who were intolerant of compromise, even naive in failing to appreciate the realities of politics.</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Perhaps their criticism might be considered extreme given the relatively small size of the parliamentary party.</p> <p>However, both Sources C and E are less critical of the Party than Source B. The latter seems to condemn the parliamentary party as a whole as unprincipled: in reference to 'Labour MPs could have been in Manchester' the implication is that none were and that they were all culpable of not 'supporting textile workers suffering starvation'. However, in Source C an MP of principle argued MPs 'ought to vote ... "according to the merits' of the particular issue', and, that he 'carried his resolution – however impractical'. In describing it in this way the author reveals her solidarity with this MP but the fact that he 'shone out' indicates that he was an exception, as a man of principle, amongst Labour MPs. In Source E a distinction is made between the Labour Government, against which the charge of being unprincipled and more concerned with power is made, and backbenchers, as the remarks 'causing disquiet amongst their own followers in Parliament', suggests that some MPs, at least, were more principled.</p> <p>Most candidates will use Source D to oppose the interpretation arguing that 'the local Labour Party programme' was taken seriously and action taken to achieve it. The fact that local politicians were prepared to go to jail in pursuit of the policy of 'equalisation of the rates' could be offered as evidence for their commitment to principles. Also, the singing of the Red Flag by the imprisoned Labour Party politicians suggests allegiance to socialist principles. The fact that they appear to have had the support of the unemployed suggests they were regarded as committed to the interests of the working class and true to their principles. It could be argued that the record of one local council is not representative of the Labour Party as a whole. Some might question whether the reform of the rates was merely tinkering with the system and did not amount to radical change of the sort associated with Labour Party rhetoric and constitutional principles of nationalisation and the social equality. The rates were merely one issue and we do not know if the local party was similarly principled on other matters.</p> <p>Source A is fairly unambiguous in highlighting the priority of principle. Socialism is said to have had 'ethical appeal' and 'it was politics inspired by idealism'. In addition, the ways in which the 'word' was spread indicates the commitment of the supporters of the Labour Party to its ideals.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>References to the 'Vocal Unions' and 'cycling corps', 'the singing of choirs' and the enthusiasm with which slogans such as 'Workers of the World Unite' were distributed suggests a pride and honesty in those involved. The piece as a whole stresses the importance of the message and the principles behind the movement. It might be argued that this is not surprising given the passage is about the propaganda work of the ILP and does not comment on Labour in power. Further, these recollections are reflecting on the early years of the party when it was trying to gain support when enthusiasm for a new venture created an optimism and belief that the ILP would make a difference because it was different. The fact that the author is writing many years after his career has ended may be something candidates could comment on to assess the utility of the evidence.</p> <p>The evidence can clearly be used to support the interpretation but a strong counter argument can be constructed. This is more likely to be effective if candidates make distinctions between different parts of the Labour Party: Governments, MPs, rank and file, ILP, Fabians etc, or comment on the question in relation to various periods. However, even candidates who are less discerning in this regard should be able to produce a sound analysis.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)	<p>Both Source B and Source D see bombing as destructive – B sees ‘a whirlwind’ and talks of the scale of bombing – millions of tons. D talks of impressive destruction and the impact on Germany – creating a ‘ruined land’. So both are aware of the power and destructiveness of the bombing. However, the thrust is different in other ways. B sees bombing as an act of revenge – the key sentence is that Germany has sowed the wind and reaped the whirlwind and Hitler’s boasts have rebounded on him. The RAF campaign is seen in terms of a technical success. There is no hint of remorse or self-criticism. In D however, the bombing is seen in a different light – there is an element of deception – ‘terror under other pretexts’ which is not present in B at all. Dresden, as opposed to Düsseldorf raises a serious query about the conduct of the war not at all raised in B. The emphasis in B is on success and achievement; but D has ‘terror and wanton destruction’. The object of bombing is not queried in B but the creation of ‘an utterly ruined land’ casts doubts on the wisdom of the policy in D.</p> <p>When considering provenance, what explains the difference is the very different context and purpose of the two sources. The speech to Londoners in 1943 (B) is to offer the consolations of revenge after the sufferings of the Blitz and in the middle of a very protracted war in which it was difficult to strike directly at the heart of German power.</p> <p>By 1943, with the aid of the US air force it was possible to inflict heavy damage on German cities and it was a matter of raising morale by drawing attention to the power of the allied attacks. Victory was so far away that it would not have occurred to Churchill to consider what the allies might take over when their forces came to control Germany. By 1945, with the end of the war in sight this became a more pressing concern. Düsseldorf had been an industrial area; Dresden far less so. D is not a public document and Churchill would not have criticised any aspect of the war in public, however ferocious such was the intense desire to bring the war to an end; but in private there could be greater reflection, particularly as the matter of post-war political and historical reputation was now a matter to be considered. In other words, moral qualms were able to be indulged in the situation in 1945, but had little place in the midst of the war in 1943. Also, what might be raised in confidence was very different to what could be said in public, particularly in the light of the very heavy losses incurred by RAF bombing crews.</p>	30	<p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for.....’</p> <p>The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>When making a judgement, candidates might consider that In the light of the bitter feelings about the bombing of Britain, it may be that B is more typical of Churchill and other war leaders' attitude to bombing; However given Churchill's generosity to defeated enemies and his scepticism about the policies of his military commanders, it might be argued that D is also typical, but not of the war as a whole. B may be seen as a more useful guide to understanding British bombing policy given Harris's beliefs that German morale would break and the heavy commitment of manpower and resources to bombing. The exceptionally high casualties of Dresden and the fact that it was primarily for the benefit of the USSR may make Churchill's regrets in D rather less typical.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>This remains a controversial topic and Bomber Command and its chief, Sir Arthur Harris, felt ill-used by Churchill after the war. Some German historians have seen the allied bombing as a war crime and the efficacy of bombing both in undermining morale in Germany and in restricting war production have been questioned. Sources E and C offer a case for the policy to have been ill-judged as a whole. Source D suggests some lack of judgement while Sources A and B see a justified and successful policy.</p> <p>The case for poor judgement: Source E sees a change of policy in 1942 leading to retaliation and having an opposite effect on German morale from that intended with the population closing ranks behind Hitler as never before. The civilian bombing at the expense of strategic bombing was ineffective and the general effect was to lengthen rather than to shorten the war. Fest offers historical rather than moral judgements, but his generation suffered directly from the bombing and he may not be an impartial observer. However, he is an expert on German wartime armament through his work on Speer who did remarkably keep production going despite the bombing.</p> <p>In Source C Bishop Bell in a brave and highly unpopular attack on wartime policy looked to the future and saw the policy as ill-judged in threatening the very values for which the war was being fought and ending any chance of the millions who were not Nazis supporting an end to the war – making a similar point to Speer about increasing rather than decreasing German support for the Hitler regime. There is a moral condemnation that ‘the roots of civilization’ are threatened; candidates might see some evidence for this in the increasing brutalization and carelessness for civilian life. Obviously, as a religious figure, Bell is speaking from a moral and philosophical perspective, but his arguments have some practical basis as well. This is a public speech with the intention to warn, but it does have some echoes in Churchill’s own view of Dresden in Source D. The point regarding poor judgement could also be developed using E’s comments about Harris and D’s regrets – did Churchill show poor judgement in first instructing him to ‘area bomb’ and then not reigning Harris in over widening the strategy. Later relations between Churchill and Harris might suggest this.</p>	70	<p>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The counter-view. However, by 1945 the outcome of war was no longer in question and criticisms of bombing may not take into account the problems of engaging with Germany in a decisive way before a Second Front was opened in June 1944. Before that the burden of the war fell on the USSR and as Source A makes clear, part of the rationale for heavy bombing of Germany was to support Stalin (or some may say to offer at relatively low cost allied support which did not involve the huge casualties of a land-based Second Front).</p> <p>There was a rational argument that German air strength was being diverted and depleted and it was certainly important to do everything possible to encourage the Russian victories in Russia in 1943 which were the turning point in the war. Stalin however regarded this as a poor substitute for actually landing large scale forces in France. There is rather more strategic justification in Source A as one would expect from the nature of the source – a joint letter to Stalin at a time when relations were quite difficult within the alliance. Source B is different, being a rousing speech to the people of London who would be less interested in strategic concerns than in seeing revenge for the raids inflicted on the capital and having their confidence boosted in the midst of a long and seemingly endless struggle by an assurance of the power and success of the RAF. Churchill's judgement here might be a morale and political one for a domestic audience. However, the effectiveness of the raids celebrated in Source B might be questioned in the light of Source E and the ability of Germany to sustain war production well into 1944–5. D might question the wisdom of persisting with terror bombing, but this was at a time when Churchill could reflect on the morality of it all and look forward to occupying Germany – perhaps luxuries not available earlier in the war when, as he said, Britain had to fight as it could rather than how it wished.</p>		

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2013

