

GCE

History A

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

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2014

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

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2014

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

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

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

Subject-specific Marking Instructions.

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

Notes related to Part A:

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

Marking Grid for Question (a)

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**Notes related to Part B:**

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

A0s	A01a and b	A02a and b
<p>Total for each 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; b. 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>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a and b
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>
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>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a and b
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>
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>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a and b
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>

The Origins and Course of the French Revolution 1774-95

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>The context is the attempt of the reforming minister Anne-Robert Turgot to increase revenue by increasing prosperity as the Physiocrats urged. Turgot was a believer in free trade and wanted to end restrictive practices and traditional barriers to progress. The Trade Guilds were a considerable vested interest and an obstacle to individual enterprise and the free development of market forces. The Parlement de Paris was a defender of traditional vested interests against 'tyranny' and hence the ideas of Turgot as expressed in A were contested by the Parlement in B a short time after they were proposed.</p> <p>Similarities: both agree that the masters did exercise authority. Turgot in A explains that they excluded non-members and restricted the number of master craftsmen. B also speaks of 'authority' but in a more positive manner. Both agree that apprentices are controlled. Both also agree that the key issues are trades, the entry to them and the training involved.</p> <p>Differences: However they disagree over control as currently exercised and they disagree over the consequences of such authority. For A it is 'slavery' of workers and 'needlessly long apprenticeships'. For B the apprentices need to be 'guided in their craft' and have their domestic life supervised. A goes on to talk about the unfair treatment of women; B is silent on this. A uses emotive language to criticise 'tyrannical' and 'bizarre' arrangements contrary to humanity. B on the other hand thinks that tyranny is more likely to come from the police regulations necessary to control apprentices if the authority of the Guilds is removed. In part it sees the proposed economic changes as just an excuse to extend arbitrary police powers into new areas. Both see terrible ills, but A as a result of the existing system and B if it is removed.</p> <p>Provenance: A – a reforming minister desiring Free Trade and reform in economic life generally is expressing a justification for a reform of an established, but restrictive institution in a published law. B- a body made up of vested interests and defending traditional authority is expressing a protest in the context of dislike of ministerial induced changes which seem likely to increase royal power. The Parlement of Paris (there were 13 but this was the most important) had come to see itself as leading national resistance to the perceived ministerial despotism of Louis XVI. It used the language of justice, the Enlightenment and liberalism but was not representative of any other than the privileged.</p> <p>Both are in the context of the law making process. Both are surprisingly emotive in their use of language as both are attempting to win support for cherished values. Both occur at the start of the reign and are keen to lay down markers for their respective positions.</p> <p>Judgement. A might be seen as useful for the desire for change, the influence of the Enlightenment or Physiocratic sentiment among the educated bourgeoisie and an indication that reform might have been possible had Turgot not fallen foul of vested interests. B might also be seen as more useful for</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
	showing the difficulties of reform that Louis's ministers faced and the passionate adherence to tradition even at the cost of economic prosperity and freedom.		
(b)	<p>A C D, royal ministers, all give an impression of necessary reforms, a desire to serve the king and to tackle the key weaknesses of late 18th century France, impaired economic progress and weak royal finance. B and E are critical. A, C and D might be ministers serving the King well by offering necessary changes which might have avoided the Revolution but B shows the discontents among the elite that this brought about and offers evidence that ministers overrode traditional concerns and sensibility and E shows the popular view that ministers were inept and corrupt and helped bring about revolution. From an artisan point of view it sees the parlements in B as championing liberty. In context, the ministers, for all their good intentions, brought problems – Turgot was politically dictatorial, Necker falsified the financial situation and opened up government in rather a dangerous way and Calonne's Assembly, to gain a form of consent for reform, failed and led the way to the Estates General. However, it could be countered that they served the King well by bringing problems to the attention of the nation by offering considered solutions. The problem with A, C and D is that all three are announcing their reforms publically and present them in the best possible light, Turgot in A by using Enlightenment language, Necker in C by explaining transparency in public affairs and Calonne in D by invoking uniformity and the public good. Yet source B is similarly tainted as the official response of the Paris Parlement to Turgot. It too uses the language of the time on the excesses of arbitrary decisions. Source E demonstrates such arguments to be successful amongst the lower artisan social strata.</p> <p>The most radical changes were perhaps those proposed by Calonne in D. By this time, Turgot's attempts to solve the financial problems by raising production and promoting economic free trade and development had failed. The opening of accounts and the financial management offered by Necker (to secure loans at lower interest rates) had not ended the deficit and was seen as a sleight of hand. Calonne offered a radical re-think of privilege and exemption. In D he refers to 'abuses in tax payment' and the 'unjust exemptions' referring to the advantages of the First and Second Estates. The proposal for a general land tax, which would include the King and the Church as well as the nobles, was a radical idea. The Corvee from which the privileged classes were exempt was a source of middle and lower class grievance. The ideas of free trade went back to Turgot and the abolition of the gabelle also reflected ideas about ending restrictions and monopolies. These reforms, however, were proposed to an Assembly which did not accept them and the 'down side' of the reform proposals were the assumption that the Assembly of Notables would be enlightened and forward-thinking enough to accept them and that the King would offer his support in the face of elite opposition, a grave miscalculation. Something of the same confidence can be seen in C in which</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>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Necker praises his own far sightedness in publishing the royal accounts, hoping to introduce the same transparency as was seen in the English system and therefore assuring the investing public that government could be trusted with money thus reducing interest rates. Rather than fundamental reforms or plans as in A and D to boost the economy, the strategy was to increase confidence. For all the self-assurance, this did not happen. The rather angry tone of A is another sign of self-belief in enlightened ideas that did not survive the poor support of the King or the vested interests which opposed it. It suggests an arrogant minister and might support the counter view that Louis XVI was not well served. Linked to the economic freedom here was the free trade in corn which produced shortages and riots. However, all the solutions proposed in A, C and D were coherent and defensible, simply not allowed to run their course.</p> <p>The counter view is in B and E, although candidates could also use elements of A, C and D (provenance and tone). None of the schemes in A, C and D were allowed to run their course. It could be argued that the strategies represented here were flawed and the tone, arguments and types of reform mentioned could be used to argue that case. None of the ministers could gain the necessary political support but it doesn't mean that their solutions were not viable and that in trying they were serving the monarchy well. B shows the lack of political support in terms of the Parlement de Paris and its vested interests and E shows that, by 1789, the Parlements were wrongly seen as defenders of liberty, the ministers as inept and corrupt; all had failed to prevent the revolutionary feelings described in the opening sentences.</p> <p>In terms of provenance, A is written at the start of the reign when a reformer like Turgot might have expected new measures supported by a new king who was far from reactionary. The tone is impassioned and reflects the impatience of the intellectual administrator towards any barrier to what he thinks is intellectually justified. It provokes in B another impassioned response from the body whose duty it is to register edicts. The Parlements had clashed with the royal government and were suspicious of any undermining of traditional social authority. Either this shows that Turgot did not consider their sensibilities or it shows that he was on the right lines in engaging with fundamental resistance to change. By 1781 the American War had made financial matters a lot worse hence the need for public confidence in government finance to ensure that vital loans were not dependent on very high interest rates. The confidence of the Preface therefore is deliberate, but in any case also reflects this minister's self-belief. It could be argued that the policy was facile and the Compte was not accurate. It could also be argued that by 1781 it was vital, with a rising deficit, to restore confidence and introduce transparency. Like A and C, D is also trying to persuade and by 1787 the financial situation is even more desperate, so a more fundamental reform is proposed. The reforms are all worthy, but the means of delivering them may be questioned and also by now the chances of major reforms had been diminished. It is not so much that the minister is not serving the king by</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>introducing overdue reforms, but whether once the Assembly of Notables had failed, there is any alternative but to call the more dangerous Estates General. E confirms the Pandora's Box of criticism that this unleashed. The author is looking back, but was part of the Parisian class that was active in politics from 1789. It is their desire for Liberty that is not really addressed in A, B and D, although this was not the ministerial remit, and is different from the conservative dislike of government reform in B. Thus the ministers, by not really proposing political liberty, could be criticised, perhaps unfairly. However, the revolutionary context had led to a mood of popular discontent and the criticism of the ministers in this source may be thought to be unfair.</p> <p>No specific judgement is expected. The ministers could be seen as pursuing sensible reforms in A, C and D while criticism may be seen as either motivated by self-interest, as in B or revolutionary fervour in E. Alternatively the criticism in B and E may show that the ministers overestimated their ability to push through change and neglected the vital political consensus that was needed for more fundamental reform of the financial system.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>Both sources emphasise Garibaldi's courage. According to A 'he risked his own safety' and 'at the approach of danger ... his presence of mind and courage were admirable' which is confirmed in B which says that 'if there is any real danger he goes to the spot at once and cannot be held back'. Both agree that he placed great store by his men and his openness towards them. In A he is described as 'like a chief of a tribe' and in B 'he is utterly simple in character', 'friendly and always prepared to meet anyone'.</p> <p>There are differences. In A it is said that 'he was always calm' but this is refuted in B which suggests that 'when angry he is terrible'. A says Garibaldi 'was deficient in those qualities which are generally supposed to be essential in a good General', without quantifying them, whereas B considers 'he lacks none of the qualities of a leader'. The implication is that in A that he was not a good conventional general whilst in B he has the qualities of a good guerrilla war leader. The sources also differ in his qualities they choose to emphasise. In A Garibaldi's attention to detail and thoroughness of his preparations are stressed. He is described as 'constantly on horseback, giving orders and visiting outposts' as well as 'examining the landscape for hours'. B, however, places store by his charisma and personal appeal. His 'firm voice and strong physique' is regarded as 'admirable' and he is revered as 'an apostle' and, it is implied, that his sincerity was respected ('in talking ... out of real conviction').</p> <p>In terms of provenance whatever, the differences between the two sources candidates are likely to recognise that both authors are favourably inclined to Garibaldi. Indeed, the way in which A refers to Garibaldi's deficiencies judged against the qualities of regular generals is more an implicit criticism of the latter than of Garibaldi. Nonetheless, some might interpret the comment that 'men set off without knowing where they might arrive' as evidence that A is mindful of Garibaldi's faults. Given the mix of praise and criticism made in A it might be argued that this source is more balanced and possibly more reliable than B. The latter offers no criticism of Garibaldi who is as perfect as 'a saint'. There is an important linguistic and tone difference here. Authorship is important in this regard. Dandolo in A was one of Garibaldi's soldiers with actual experience of life in Garibaldi's army and who had, no doubt, received orders from him and had time to make an assessment of his leadership. Monnier was a foreign observer measuring Garibaldi from the perspective of how others reacted to him. As a writer and possible intellectual he may be pre-disposed to admire Garibaldi. It might also be suggested that as a soldier Dandolo was of a more practical mind. Further, the context in which the sources were written is important. When A was written Garibaldi was struggling to defend Rome and experiencing setbacks, ultimately having to retreat from the city. On the other hand, when B was writing Garibaldi had conquered Sicily and</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>Naples and was feted as a victor and highly successful commander who had prevailed against the odds. The 'liberation' of the South was already being seen as one of the great moments of 19th century history and it was writers like Monnier who contributed to this in such passages. Some may comment on the myth of the Red Shirts as something that clouds any assessment of Garibaldi.</p> <p>Judgements may thus conclude that A is more reliable than B for the reasons above.</p>		
(b)	<p>The sources provide a mix of approaches to Garibaldi – a soldier, a foreign writer, King Victor Emmanuel II, a popular cartoon and Garibaldi himself. Between them they comment on a variety of groups and their responses to Garibaldi. All sources provide evidence of the support and admiration enjoyed by Garibaldi, though B, C and D indicate that this was not universal. Although not stated explicitly sources A and E show that soldiers in Garibaldi's command admired him. Men were prepared to follow him. In A we are told 'men set off without knowing where they might arrive' and Garibaldi was 'a chief of a tribe', which suggests he enjoyed the 'tribal' loyalty of his men. This source provides a matter-of-fact and balanced sketch of Garibaldi as a commander and may be considered by candidates as sound evidence particularly when measured against the opponent in 1849 – the French army. This could be confirmed with reference to the events in Rome in 1849 and Garibaldi's attempts to defend the city against the French. E paints a picture of soldiers prepared to press ahead despite the demoralising news of Italian defeat at Custoza. They 'advanced with forced marches' largely, it seems, because they had complete confidence in Garibaldi, implying they really admired him. Garibaldi describes his men as 'entirely loyal to me [Garibaldi]', 'never doubted my [Garibaldi's] orders' and 'trusting in me [Garibaldi]'. Indeed, Garibaldi implies that it was because they admired him so much 'they had led them to leave their homes in the first place'. Some might question the reliability of such a claim given Garibaldi's authorship and its place in his own retrospective autobiography post unification in 1870. On the other hand Garibaldi ascribes their commitment to 'patriotism and enthusiasm' and 'their confidence in their country's destiny' and, more modestly, implies that he merely channelled this energy. Candidates might comment on the fact that his men were 'volunteers' whose commitment was not in doubt, many of whom had fought with Garibaldi in earlier campaigns. Details about the Red Shirts and the huge reputation Garibaldi and his men had by 1866 could usefully be deployed to assess the source in terms of the relationship between Garibaldi and his men.</p> <p>Garibaldi's support from the people is made clear in B, implicitly in C and D. In B and D Garibaldi is revered as a saint: 'a saint sent to deliver them' (B) and in D the initial 'S' is used before his</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>name, he has a halo above his head and his bust sits on the altar. The very title of the cartoon emphasises the esteem in which Garibaldi was held. Both provide reasons for his popularity. In B Garibaldi's personality and attitude to people is emphasised. He is described as 'friendly and always prepared to meet anyone' and he appears to inspire by 'real conviction'. All in all Garibaldi enjoyed 'genuine support'. The cartoon has a shaft of light within which is the word 'LIBERTY' implying that his popularity was based on the freedom Garibaldi's exploits gave Italians. Given the account in B is supported by the cartoon candidates might argue this suggests it is reliable. However, some are likely to challenge the value of D simply on the grounds that cartoons tend to be one-sided in their view point and that such hero-worship is being implicitly criticised. Nonetheless, ever since his exploits in Rome in 1849 Garibaldi had been portrayed in prints and pictures as a saint, some likening him to Christ. In contrast, elements of B suggest it is objective, although B itself is from a foreign observer whose intellectual stance suggests a form of hero-worship. Further, context might be deployed to explain how the majority of people in Naples were glad to see the demise of the authoritarian regime in Naples, confirmed in a subsequent plebiscite. C hints at the support Garibaldi enjoyed with the people in the reference to the proposal put to the King that Garibaldi should 'proceed peacefully to Rome'. In saying Garibaldi would be 'at the head of an enormous mass of Italians' the King, or at least those who recommended the proposal, confirm that Garibaldi was extremely popular.</p> <p>However, Garibaldi was not supported by everyone. A is not uncritical of his military qualities, as is Victor Emmanuel in C ('makes a mess of everything'). B admits that 'landlords and town councillors were fearful of Garibaldi'. Given the author was a foreign observer, who also acknowledges the support Garibaldi enjoyed and is pro Garibaldi, candidates may see this remark as reliable especially if linked to context. Throughout his procession from Sicily, Garibaldi had allowed the redistribution of land to varying degrees and local officials had had their authority checked as Garibaldi assumed the powers of a dictator, however temporary. C indicates the hostility of the King who is vitriolic in condemning Garibaldi saying he 'will destroy him' and that he rejected the proposal he be allowed to march on Rome. The King justifies his opposition on the grounds that Garibaldi 'makes a mess of everything'. However, candidates will know that this is a little disingenuous as Victor Emmanuel is thought to have approved of Garibaldi's expedition but subsequently withdrew his support when it was apparent that France would not tolerate the seizure of Rome. Candidates might reflect on how the King had backed Garibaldi in his campaign of 1860 and how he had happily received the territories of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies from Garibaldi at Teano in 1860. Lastly, D reinforces the point that France opposed Garibaldi as Napoleon III is seen trying to extinguish the candles on the altar. He does so alongside the Pope.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Candidates will know that both men opposed any change to the independence of the Papacy, Napoleon for domestic political reasons and Pius IX to retain his temporal power. Knowledge of the Pope's hostility to Italian nationalism since the Allocution of 1848 would be appropriate and the actions of Napoleon III in restoring and upholding the Pope in power since 1849 could be considered. The alliance of Rattazzi to these two men indicates how politicians and Piedmont were opposed to Garibaldi whom they regarded as a threat to their own power and a dangerous demagogue whose radical ideas threatened the new Piedmontese/Italian regime. Rattazzi sent an army to check Garibaldi in 1862 when the latter was actually wounded, very similar to the action Cavour took in 1860.</p> <p>In judgement, candidates may conclude that Garibaldi was not universally admired in so far as certain individuals and groups opposed him and the provenance of sources like A and C is reliable, one a soldier with Garibaldi in 1848/9, the other a diplomatic report to the British government of Victor Emmanuel's feelings. Both provide some negative comments although both are inclined to favour Garibaldi. However, it would be reasonable to claim that he enjoyed the admiration of the majority of ordinary Italians, at least at certain times, although one could question the reliability of Garibaldi's retrospective comments in E and the intellectual approval of the foreign observer Monnier in B. It is worth noting that all the sources come from pro Garibaldi authors, although C purports to be reporting Victor Emmanuel's words.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>There are many similarities in terms of content given their anti-slavery provenance. Both oppose slavery because it denies freedom. In A Garrison invokes the ‘unalienable rights among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness’, denied by slavery, and in D Brown is blunt in claiming ‘the design on my part to free the slaves’. Both oppose slavery as a religious calling. In A the author says, ‘I thank God that he enabled me to speak his truth’ and in D the author invokes the teaching of the New Testament as a reason for opposing slavery. Both claim to oppose slavery in pursuit of justice and truth. In A Garrison emphasises his commitment to ‘truth’ and ‘justice’ and in D Brown stresses his ultimate aim is ‘to achieve justice’. Both are motivated by a strong sense of personal conviction that explains their opposition to slavery. In A Garrison claims ‘time will show that I was right’ and in D Brown defends his actions as ‘right not wrong’.</p> <p>It could be argued that there is a degree of difference in their sense of personal commitment as Brown is prepared to die (‘forfeit my life’) for the cause if necessary whilst, implicitly, Garrison is not. Brown also puts more emphasis on God, the Bible (Old Testament) and religion in general than does Garrison.</p> <p>The first difference might be assessed in the evaluation of the provenance. Brown was on trial for his life and making what he almost certainly knew would be his last statement against slavery. As such his courtship of martyrdom was, possibly, nothing more than a dramatic gesture. Garrison was writing much earlier in the first edition of a magazine that he assumed would continue to promote the abolitionist cause. Both men were staking a claim. Garrison was establishing his credentials as the leader of the abolition movement and Brown was determined to secure his position as a hero of the cause and, possibly, to inspire others by staying true to his principles and showing dignity in the face of death. Both men are appealing to the public and as wide an audience as possible, if largely Northern opinion. However, Brown was clearly in a position to address Southerners. Garrison was pitching his comments more at Northern opinion. Similarly, by 1831 abolitionist activity was still limited and Garrison was intent on writing on the subject in the future. There is an optimism and confidence about Garrison’s words. Aware that ‘many object to the severity of my language’ he is determined to stick to his task. By contrast, Brown, writing almost 30 years later, had experienced years of protest and setbacks in the cause of abolition and his comments strike a more realistic note about the difficulty of achieving success. Candidates might develop this by reference to the dates. When A was published the Missouri Compromise had just been agreed and it appeared that slavery had been contained whereas by 1858, when D was spoken, a second Compromise (1850) had been necessary, there had been civil war in Kansas and the Dred Scott case had deflated abolitionist morale.</p> <p>In making a judgement some candidates may argue that both sources indicate the commitment, even fanaticism of abolitionists and provide a fair summary of the main political and religious</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for ...’.</p> <p>The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>reasons for opposition to slavery. The reliability of the sources might be challenged, however, given the propaganda circumstances of both (assessed above). Relevant contextual knowledge is considerable and can usefully be deployed to support the assessment of the sources.</p>		
(b)	<p>All the sources can be used as evidence for the interpretation that abolitionist activity undermined their cause though only C is unequivocal. A counter argument, that their activities advanced the cause, can be constructed using parts of A and B, D and E.</p> <p>In C, abolition societies are condemned for having ‘produced nothing good or valuable’. Webster credits them with arousing ‘very strong feelings’ but accuses them of hardening opinion in the slave States and of making things worse. Indeed, he believes, ‘public opinion, which in Virginia had begun to move against slavery, drew back and shut itself up in its castle’. Further, the result of abolitionist activities has been ‘to bind faster the slave population of the South’. Candidates may point to the reluctance of the South to change, evident in the ambitions of some to expand slavery into Texas and the ruthlessness with which dissent in the South was crushed, for example Nat Turner, 1831. Indeed, during the debates which led to the Compromise of 1850, of which this extract was a part, Southern politicians made it clear that defence of slavery was the priority. Candidates might argue that as a contribution to these debates source C is flawed as the author was looking for ways to persuade the South to reach an agreement and he thus deliberately criticises the abolitionists. Further, this speech concentrates on opinion in the South only, and whilst it may accurately reflect attitudes there, it does not make any comment on views in the North. It may also be mistaken in its view of southern reaction.</p> <p>Other evidence for the undermining of their cause is found in A. Garrison is aware that ‘many object to the severity of my language’ and that ‘it is thought that I hinder the cause of abolition by the coarseness of my argument’. However, he claims ‘the charge is not true’. Yet, both B and C (representing Southern and Northern opinion) refer to ‘inflammatory publications’ which suggests that some of the literature of the abolitionists was damaging in terms of support for the cause especially in the South. It may be in C they had ‘The Liberator’ in mind as it remained the main organ of the abolitionist movement throughout the period. Nonetheless, the fact that the paper survived and expanded its circulation suggests that Garrison may have been correct in saying that ‘time will show that I was right’ and this serves to refute the interpretation that the activities of abolitionists undermined support for their cause. However, B makes it clear that abolitionist activity in general, including ‘petitions made to Congress, upset those in the South as they are described as ‘fanatical’.</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The general thrust of E makes it clear that hostility to the abolitionists was such that the people of Floyd County in Georgia contemplate secession in 1860. This suggests that moderate opinion in the county has been marginalised and that the activities of the abolitionists – ‘continued abuse of their constitutional rights’, ‘the shameless nullification of the Fugitive Slave Law’, ‘armed invasion’ (all of which could be developed with context) – served to entrench conservative opinion. Candidates may argue it was unlikely that abolitionist activity would win much support in Georgia where slavery was so widely accepted. Knowledge that it was on 20th December 1860 that South Carolina seceded from the Union might be mentioned to illustrate that the views in E were shared in other places. The trial of Brown, and his expectation that he would be executed, expressed in D, might be used to confirm the hostility of the South to the abolitionists.</p> <p>Evidence that refutes the interpretation and argues for the successful advancement of the abolitionist cause can be found in A, B, D and E. Source B concedes that ‘from the 1830s’ abolitionists ‘gained strength’ and had ‘sufficient influence’ to ‘ignore the Fugitive Slave Laws’ and to urge Congress ‘to restrict the extension of slavery’. It admits that ‘the abolitionists are stronger now than in the 1830s’. All this suggests that the activities accredited to abolitionist societies - presses, lecturers, inflammatory publications, and petitions – actually gained support for their cause. However, B makes it clear that this was true of the North, rather than the Union as a whole. Further, B claims that the abolitionists were a ‘small fanatical party’ although Calhoun does so from a southern perspective, implying that they represented a minority. Candidates might allude to the considerable opposition that existed in the North to abolition to vouch for the veracity of the source and/or argue that a Southern Senator noted for his defence of Southern rights might deliberately under-estimate the extent of the support enjoyed by abolitionist societies.</p> <p>The case for a successful promoting of their cause is also evident in E. Candidates might cross reference with B on some issues. It agrees that ‘the abolitionist sentiment of the Northern States has ... steadily increased’ although since 1820 (‘the last forty years’) rather than ‘the 1830s’ as claimed in B. Also, E agrees that the Fugitive Slave Law has not been enforced referring to their ‘shameless nullification’, allowing candidates scope to explain how many states in the North passed Personal Liberty Laws. It could be argued that the latter were introduced because popular opinion favoured such policy. E also admits that ‘abolitionists have prompted armed invasion of Southern soil which encouraged large numbers of Northern people to turn against the South’. This point allows linkage with D which is based on the most celebrated example of ‘armed invasion’. Candidates might argue that D is untypical of abolitionist activity and an example of the extremism</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>of a minority. Yet, the fact that some individuals were prepared to risk their lives in pursuit of abolition could be used to argue that many more might sympathise with the moral argument held by Brown even if they were not prepared to go to such lengths. After all, a similar moral position is adopted in A but the action advocated in that source is one of persuasion with the pen rather than violence and personal sacrifice. The propaganda aspect of D might be considered with some candidates arguing that it discredits the source but others might point to the previous actions of Brown in which he demonstrated a sincerity of conviction in the efficacy of 'armed insurrection'. Much will depend on how candidates see Brown's typicality and impact.</p> <p>In forming a judgement candidates may argue that the sources are useful in providing views from both sides of the debate. Some are particularly reliable, such as B and E, as they admit to the strength of the abolitionists even though they despise them suggesting that they didn't undermine their cause. Others like Webster in C, who suggest they did, may have their evidence tempered by their purpose, in Webster's case the preservation of unity during the debate on the Compromise of 1850. Some may conclude that perspectives were of key importance in assessing the strength of support for the activities of abolitionists. For example, mention of Northern people having 'organised a party confined to the hostile North.' in E, could be used to explain Southern views of the Republican Party and the subsequent election of Lincoln, even though the latter denied any agenda to abolish slavery.</p>		

4	(a)	<p>The Sources are similar in that both show that Germans, in the view of Federal Republic ministers, are behaving selfishly and are creating economic problems. Source D says that small family groups or even single people are clinging on to large flats where the rents are controlled and thus cheap. Source E confirms this impression, implying that Germans are only interested in earning high wages and working shorter hours, whatever the cost to wider society. The trade unions specifically illustrate this trend. They will price themselves out of a job in comparison to their competition where wage increases are running at a much lower percentage. Both ministers want to take corrective State action, Lucke in D by loosening the controls on rents, Adenauer in E through wage and price controls.</p> <p>The sources also differ in their reaction to economic problems in terms of blame. Source D finds the fault to be over regulation by the State in Housing whilst E finds fault with the German people and especially the German Trade Union movement. The Sources also differ in the problems they highlight. Source D is much more concerned with the housing issue and the need to provide adequate housing for families, while Source E is more about the wider economic situation (consumption, purchasing power and labour costs). Its concern is with German competitiveness and the problems of consuming more than they produce. Source D argues that state control has been too inflexible, while Source E is arguing for more state control of prices and wages. Source E hints that efforts to force higher productivity will not work with the German people and especially the Trade Union movement. It also sees the problems in an international context and is worried that West Germany will lose its competitive edge.</p> <p>The provenance and context of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both are government reactions to current (D) and future (E) problems. The dates of the sources can be used to assess them, 1959 and 1962. By the latter there were fears of the economy becoming uncompetitive. Both sources come from CDU government ministers and politicians – the Centre Right. Erhard takes a more anti-Union approach whilst Lucke is concerned to free up the housing market by relaxing rent controls thus encouraging landlords to rent out more of their available property (low fixed rents pre and post war had discouraged this). The new measure being proposed by Lucke in 1959 was to enable larger families to be housed in larger flats, already available. It resulted from the policies of the government to encourage family life and to draw a distinction between life in West and East Germany. In terms of judgement candidates could argue that this is less useful than Source E in 1962 which is by the architect of the economic miracle, who had come to recognise that the world had changed since the inception of the GDR and note needed to be taken, especially of labour and price costs which worked off each other, or the miracle would fizzle out. Germans who enjoyed a reputation as hard workers had begun to relax and this worried Erhard. His tone is that of puzzlement and concern, especially as he was in line for the succession to Adenauer. Nonetheless no set judgement is expected.</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> <p>A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgements should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>
---	-----	---	----	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The Sources contain references to different interpretations, so they may be grouped according to their view. The supporting view, that West Germany was an unqualified success in economic and social matters is found in Sources A, B, C and parts of D and E. The opposing view, that there were some qualifications to success, particularly social, is outlined in Sources D and E.</p> <p>The supporting view in Source A, a newspaper report, albeit one which favoured the CDU government, shows that West Germans had indeed, achieved an unqualified economic miracle in a range of aspects – production, exports, employment, currency, housing, clothing and food as early as 1953. There is a celebratory tone here attributing it all to hard work and Dr Erhard, but it may well hide some tensions and compromises. Source B, the report from Bosch, supports this success with details of how the demand for Bosch products has grown and they are even exporting their goods. It indicates that consumer durables (kitchen goods and cars) were now available for domestic consumption, although a Company Report may well put an over positive gloss on its achievements for the sake of the shareholders. Nonetheless own knowledge could easily be used to support the claims made. Source E from a much later date, 1962, comments retrospectively on the wage affluence of West Germans and their ability to consume ever greater amounts, although Erhard in this source is critical of this trend and may well be publicly laying down a marker for his constituency of conservative supporters in industry and the middle classes in the later Adenauer era. Source C, the article about pension reform, supports the view that there was success in improving a generous pension scheme, with no means testing and where the pension is to become a legal right. The amount of the pension is to be enough to ensure a good living standard for all workers and testifies to the success of West Germany under Adenauer. Clearly from a CDU point of view such a pension was affordable. Sources D and E both from government ministers, suggest that some lives have been improved, with cheap housing for some (tenants) in D and high wages in E. However all the sources have a CDU slant – three are Government ministers, one from a key German company to its shareholders and the other from the pro CDU press. One might expect the promotion of ‘unqualified success’ from such sources. There are no opposition views.</p> <p>The opposing view is clearest in Source D which shows that some of the largest accommodation is being hogged by small families to the detriment of those bringing up more children. It hints that there are growing housing problems in West Germany and own</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, and limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing on the terms of the the question, but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>knowledge may comment on the large influx of refugees from the East willing to work at lower rates of pay and who needed housing. This may lie behind Lucke's plan to open up the renting market, although it could be pointed out that it will also help landlords at the expense of existing tenants. Some candidates may usefully cross reference this to the contrary comment in Source A that 5 million houses have been built over the previous 5 years (provided one realises that this was, in part, the response to mass bombing of the German housing stock). In Source C the pension reforms are only coming in 1957 so the improvement here is relatively late, although the thrust of this source is to see success in creating a social market. Source E warns that there will increasingly be losers whose lives will be far from improved if the rush to high wages continues. Erhard, the key Minister of Economics, whom many saw as the West German miracle worker, is sounding a note of caution amidst the apparent 'successes'. He hints at tension between government and trade unions and points to the strains of the 1960s. Nonetheless candidates may point to an agenda here that lies more in the future than in the 1950s where 'wealth grew'.</p> <p>The provenance and context of the Sources should be integrated into the discussion. Source A is a propaganda piece to win support for the social market economy, but its facts on 'unqualified success' are not necessarily unreliable, they simply omit the scale of the post war problem and at least the newspaper acknowledges, from a CDU perspective, the hard work of ordinary Germans, although most of the credit is given to Erhard. Source B is likely to be reliable as companies must comply with legal requirements in making reports and the facts could be easily checked. Candidates might refer to the high reputation enjoyed by Bosch yet point to the positive gloss of all Company reports. The other sources are all by ministers in the government who will thus want to defend their actions or propose new measures to remedy perceived problems. Source C is an official and largely factual source and shows the determination to give fair pensions to all. However some candidates might suggest that not all Germans of this generation were likely to have an unblemished and continuous work record ('size of the pension is calculated on a normal working life'), and will know that pensions were moderated to take account of this. Source D is addressing a specific problem in the housing market which was to be solved by ending the fixed rents which had been in place since the Weimar republic and hence is likely to be reliable, although candidates may question Lucke's motives and use the source for both views. In Source E, Erhard, soon to take over as Chancellor, is laying out his stall for the future but he is the person best placed to understand the difficulties in the economy and, given the plaudits he reaps in Source A, could be expected to be reliable as to both</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>success and future failures.</p> <p>Candidates may use their own knowledge to refer to currency reform, the economic miracle, the reduction in unemployment, the consumer boom and higher disposable incomes, all of which show that West Germany enjoyed unqualified success and would support most of the sources. The victory for the governing party in three successive elections suggests that something was going well for the Christian Democrats, two of whom appear reasonably confident of success. The need to prevent Germany lapsing into extremism on the right or the left also played a part but, as the later sources suggest, by the later 1950s there was less stability and even a possibility of economic stagnation. The Sources do not refer to lower waged eastern refugees, later guest-workers from southern Europe, women (increasingly squeezed out of the West German labour force) or to other aspects of the West German state (the accommodation with ex Nazis and the narrowing of the political base around the CDU under so called 'Chancellor Democracy'). Candidates may thus produce a mixed response based on the dating of the sources – success (A and B) followed by qualification of that success by 1959-62 (C, D and E) or on the establishment and public nature of all the sources who only hint at or infer problems that may have been much wider than acknowledged. They may also make a distinction between economic success (A and B) and social, the latter proving more problematic in Sources C, D and E. Success may thus be qualified to a greater or lesser extent.</p> <p>Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (a)	<p>The contents and provenance of the Sources have some similarities. They are dated from the same day, six weeks after Chinese penetration of North Korea and just three days after US/UN troops suffered a major reverse and retreated before the advancing Chinese troops. Both are concerned over the implications of Chinese intervention. They agree that Communist China had acted aggressively by intervening in Korea six weeks before. Both the authors are central to war policy, MacArthur as Commander-in-Chief of US forces in the Far East, and Marshall, also a General, as the Secretary of Defense. However, one has a military capacity on the spot and the other a senior political role in Washington. The introduction to Source B states that General Marshall had ordered MacArthur to cross the 38th parallel in September 1950 and knowledge might be used to explain that Chinese intervention in Korea has been attributed mainly to US/UN forces invading communist North Korea and advancing towards the Yalu River, the Chinese frontier, and Chinese Manchuria.</p> <p>However the Sources have distinct differences in content. Source A suggests that the Chinese intervention in Korea was the result of its own strategy planned after the US/UN landing at Inchon. In contrast Marshall, in Source B, sees Chinese intervention as evidence of ‘a carefully laid Russian trap’, which might be explained as a design to lure the Americans into invading China or using Chinese Nationalist forces. Russian purposes might be inferred as to divert attention away from Soviet influence in Korea and involve the US in a major war with China. On the other hand, MacArthur, in Source A, blames China itself for its secrecy and cloak of neutrality and claims the ultimate objective of China was ‘to launch a spring offensive’ of ‘overwhelming strength’ to completely destroy all UN forces in Korea. Knowledge of the typicality of these Chinese tactics under Mao might be used to evaluate the credibility of Marshall’s claim that the USSR directed events, lessening the reliability of Source B. They also differ on how to react to Chinese intervention. The implication of MacArthur in A is that the Chinese are a serious threat and must be halted. He is an advocate of using this to launch an invasion of China to reverse the communist triumph in 1949. In contrast Marshall in B strongly opposes this and is aware of the wider Cold War context.</p> <p>It might be supplied from knowledge and provenance that MacArthur in Source A, unlike Marshall in Source B, advised an offensive policy against China, even suggesting the use of nuclear weapons. It might be added that the introduction to Source B suggests that Marshall had been of a similar opinion at the time the 38th parallel was crossed, but had shifted his view to one of ‘limited war’, although to cross the 38th parallel was not to attack China, only to take the war into North Korea. In evaluation, it might be suggested that these differences might be explained by MacArthur’s purpose to justify his forward policy of ‘rolling back’ communism against previous US containment policy under Truman. Therefore it might be suggested that MacArthur may give less reliable evidence on the danger posed</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: a comparison of Sources</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for ...’.</p> <p>The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>by China in Source A as he is trying to persuade the government in Washington from his base in Tokyo and may not have Marshall's range of diplomatic information. Nonetheless his telegram is largely confined to a factual account of Chinese intervention, speculative only in the final two sentences. Therefore, Source B, an internal top secret address to the National Security, may be more informed and useful as to US official views. In light of UN links, it represents the official line of US policy makers on whose orders MacArthur should act. The introduction to Source B confirms this, although it might be supplied from knowledge that MacArthur, in Source A, disobeyed orders and was sacked in April 1951, so his hot-headed attitude might put his evidence, especially his final views, in question. Nonetheless events largely confirmed his fears of a further spring offensive although the possible destruction of UN forces in Korea is speculative. The Cold War context of the sources explains Marshall's caution, and it might be known that the Marshall Plan for reconstruction was named after him, suggesting that his view was central to US Cold War policy post 1945. Thus as a 'US view' Marshall's, in Source B, is typical of government views, but MacArthur, in Source A, had a huge following among right wing Americans and may well have been right as to ultimate Chinese intention. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Candidates may pursue three possible lines of interpretation. Sources A, and, in part, B and D are useful in support of the interpretation in the question, that China was to blame. Sources B, E and, to an extent, C and D, suggest that the USSR was to blame while C and, in part, Sources A, B and D might be used to suggest that the USA was to blame.</p> <p>Sources A and, in part B and D, support the interpretation in the question that China was to blame. Source A charges the Chinese with aggressively building up forces for a spring offensive to crush UN forces, of secrecy and pretended neutrality – dishonourable conduct in prolonging a war which MacArthur may have considered he had already won against North Korea. There are limitations, however. MacArthur’s version of events omits many of his own actions which had provoked Chinese intervention in Korea. This is a telegram which seeks to persuade the Joint Chiefs to take action against China. The introduction to Source B links with Source A in confirming that MacArthur was given the go-ahead to cross the 38th parallel by Marshall thus taking the war into North Korea although B considers Chinese action to be an attempt to lure the US into a trap. The limitation is that there is no specific mention in A and B of MacArthur’s own advance to the Yalu River and his threat to Manchuria and China, although in B there is the implication that this might be a possibility (it warns against). MacArthur’s claim that the Chinese planned intervention after Inchon might be seen to confirm that his actions caused their intervention. Knowledge might be used to develop his suggestions of nuclear strikes on China and his wish to cross the Yalu, contributing to his removal in April 1951, all of which would suggest that it was not China who was to blame for prolonging war although candidates might point to the massive Chinese penetration of the North to rescue the North Koreans following Inchon. Source D is similar to A, both in its military authorship and in its fears of Chinese aggression, but D goes on to comment on S.E. Asia as a whole. It is written at the end of the war when a peace treaty was imminent. It advocates a continuance of war given wider Chinese ambitions. However, Source D here is less useful as evidence for this interpretation, as it suggests that China does <i>not</i> wish to prolong the war but to sign a peace so it can advance its wider ambitions in S.E. Asia. Like Source A, it is unreliable in its evidence on Chinese intention and blame. Both are speculating as to Chinese policy from a US military ground perspective but both are key US commanders in the war. Both saw the Chinese as aggressors bearing a large part of the blame. MacArthur in particular wanted to reverse what he saw as the key US failure in 1949 to prevent a communist China.</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>Sources B, E and in part D are useful in support of an alternative interpretation, that the USSR was to blame for prolonging the Korean War. Source B blames the USSR for carefully laying a trap to provoke the USA, with or without the UN, into a general war with Communist China via Chinese intervention in North Korea in October 1950. It might be argued that, rather than prolonging the Korean War, this might have ended it more quickly, as it might have diverted into a third world war. Instead it was US policy to continue a limited war that was to blame for prolonging the Korean War. Marshall states unequivocally that the USSR was dictating Chinese aggression in Korea, and knowledge of the Sino-Soviet treaty signed between Stalin and Mao in Moscow on 22 January 1950 might be used to develop this. However, it may be evaluated as unreliable in the light of Mao’s independent, nationalist policies and cross-referenced for the interpretation in the question in Source A which states that China acted on its own behalf in prolonging the war. Nonetheless Marshall is a key element in the formulation of US policy and would have been supplied with the latest intelligence reports. It is clearly his view that the USSR was manipulating the war, treating the Chinese as puppets. Source C’s introduction strongly suggests that Stalin was the obstacle to peace and that he was using the PoW issue to do this. Source D, by suggesting that the US was moving towards peace and that the Chinese also wanted peace, indirectly implies that it could only be the USSR who was holding up a treaty. It might also be argued that the USSR wished China to intervene openly to distract US/UN forces while the USSR secretly aided North Korea. Thus Source B and C link with Source E. In E, the Polish military attaché, in North Korea at the time, confirms Soviet control of North Korean war policy, supplying troops, aircraft, pilots, weapons and infrastructure, thus prolonging a war which North Korea would otherwise have quickly lost. Source E squarely puts the blame on the USSR for controlling and prolonging the war at arm’s length. Provenance and context might be used to evaluate this group of sources. At the time, the author of Source E was a communist aide to the USSR, China and North Korea, acting as a military adviser, so might be evaluated as reliable (in a position to know). However, as a US immigrant, he has renounced his communist past and may be establishing his loyalty to his new country by exaggerating Soviet influence 1950-53 in the context of current 1960 Cold War tensions. It might be known that 1960 saw the Gary Powers U2 incident. Thus Source E’s reliability might be brought into question due to hindsight, authorship and context although it fits what is known about the war. Source C is a letter exchange between a US captain in charge of communist PoWs and President Truman. Knowledge might be used to confirm that Russia refused to agree that communist prisoners held by the Americans could choose whether to</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>return to North Korea or China. The Russians and perhaps the Chinese are using the issue to prolong the war. It may also be suggested that the US was refusing to budge on the PoW issue. It suggests the US was holding out on PoWs. Source D might also be seen to share MacArthur’s right-wing views on the Chinese threat. His purpose seems to be to persuade the public that a peace treaty will endanger US interests elsewhere in Asia by allowing Chinese strength to build up. His sense of US superiority might be seen as misguided in the light of the outcome of the war. He does not mention the Russians and appears, as a former US general, to be mainly concerned about the Chinese. Source B seems the most reliable source in the group, as Marshall’s condemnation of Soviet policy is based on diplomacy and his access to wide ranging information; it is spontaneous and objective, unlike C (letters on a specific and emotive issue) or E. There may be an interim judgement made on how convincingly this group of sources support the interpretation in the question.</p> <p>Sources C and in part A, B and D might be used for a third argument, that the USA was mainly to blame for prolonging the Korean War. Source C, Truman and Ewing, are discussing the PoW issue and whether to refuse to return those communist prisoners who sought western asylum, a difficult one given the fear of admitting communist agents into the west. Truman is clear that they should not be returned forcibly, as the USSR and China demanded. By saying this he is, in effect, delaying peace and prolonging the war. However candidates may regard this as a side issue, not linked to any genuine desire to prolong the conflict, and dismiss it as flimsy evidence on which to convict the US, although as in Sources A and D there was an influential body of opinion that wanted to continue and widen the war. Source A might be used with the introduction to B to argue that MacArthur’s advance beyond the 38th parallel prolonged the war, which might otherwise have ended when UN troops reached the 38th parallel. Source B confirms that crossing the 38th parallel was a political decision by the US and UN to address North Korean aggression, but knowledge might qualify the content by suggesting that UN forces held back the US from total war. Source D is not an influential voice, as a retired general. However, he typifies US right wing opinion and speaks out in favour of total war from a position of supposed US superiority, although he does admit the American people wanted peace. The sources supporting this view are likely to be seen to imply rather than argue the case for blaming the USA. However, it is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.</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 2014

