

## **History A**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

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

### **Mark Scheme for June 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

## Annotations

Annotation	Meaning

## 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)

<b>A0s</b>	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>A02a</b>
Total for each question = 30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
<b>Level 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness.</li> <li>• Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13–14</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately.</li> <li>• Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>15–16</b></p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts.</li> <li>• Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>11–12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13–14</b></p>

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

<b>A0s</b>	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>A02a</b>
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement.</li> <li>Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context.</li> <li>Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3–4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic.</li> <li>Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3–5</b></p>
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance.</li> <li>Weak or non-existent context with no conceptual understanding.</li> <li>No structure with extremely weak communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment.</li> <li>Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–2</b></p>

**Question (b) Maximum mark 70**

	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>A02a</b>
<b>1</b>	20–22	42–48
<b>2</b>	17–19	35–41
<b>3</b>	13–16	28–34
<b>4</b>	9–12	21–27
<b>5</b>	6–8	14–20
<b>6</b>	3–5	7–13
<b>7</b>	0–2	0–6

**Notes related to Part B:**

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

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>b. the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level.</li> <li>• Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources.</li> <li>• Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>20–22</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of <b>all</b> the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation.</li> <li>• Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation.</li> <li>• Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>42–48</b></p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance.</li> <li>• A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context.</li> <li>• Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>17–19</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grouped analysis and use of <b>most</b> of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation.</li> <li>• Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent.</li> <li>• Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>35–41</b></p>
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainly sound analysis, argument and explanation, but there may be some description and unevenness. Judgement may be incomplete or inconsistent with the analysis of content and provenance.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive.</li> <li>• Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13–16</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance.</li> <li>• Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing.</li> <li>• There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>28–34</b></p>



A0s	A01a and b	A02a
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts some analysis, argument and explanation but underdeveloped and not always linked to the question. There will be more assertion, description and narrative. Judgements are less substantiated and much less convincing.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential.</li> <li>• Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9–12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described.</li> <li>• May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely.</li> <li>• An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>21–27</b></p>
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement.</li> <li>• Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5–8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped.</li> <li>• There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general.</li> <li>• There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14–20</b></p>
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question.</li> <li>• Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Little organisation or structure with poor communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3–4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation.</li> <li>• A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content.</li> <li>• No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7–13</b></p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question.</li> <li>• No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context.</li> <li>• Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive.</li> <li>• No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately.</li> <li>• No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–6</b></p>

## The origins and course of the French Revolution 1774–95

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)	<p>The Sources differ on several points. <b>Source B</b> sees that the state is in peril. <b>Source A</b> thinks that unrest finds no rallying point and that a chance of a serious uprising is remote. <b>Source B</b> is concerned about the ‘stirring up of minds’ and the publication of new political demands. <b>Source A</b> does not specifically contradict the existence of publications, but states that they seem to have had little effect in Paris where the citizens have never given any thought to politics. <b>Source A</b> argues that the King rules as he pleases, but <b>Source B</b> sees that the King has had to accept the publication of opinions which would hitherto have been seen as treasonable. <b>Source B</b> sees a change in the situation, but <b>A</b> does not: the Parisians continue not to put liberty as a priority. There is some agreement. <b>A</b> refers to ‘talk of unrest’ which would agree with the ‘stirring up of minds’ and the ‘new political demands’. <b>A</b> also agrees with <b>B</b> that there has been ‘some radical ideas and writing’; this links to <b>B</b>’s ‘new political demands’. <b>A</b> specifically mentions the influence on the educated classes while <b>B</b> does not, though this may be implicit.</p> <p>To explain the differences, the purpose and authorship of the Sources may be considered. <b>B</b> is written by Louis XVI’s family members concerned about the effects of the discussions of the Assembly of Notables and the impact of proposals for reform on their own privileges and on the nobles generally. <b>A</b>, however, has no particular motive for either inflating or playing down unrest. His is a comment by a journalist on the mood of the capital; <b>B</b> however is looking at the national impact. The heavy military presence in the capital noted in <b>A</b> would not apply to the provinces where the princes had their estates. Some may know that the Princes became the leaders of the counter-revolution and this ideological hatred of criticisms of the sacredness of monarchy may explain the more virulent tone of <b>B</b> and its emotive language ‘The state is in peril’ while the author of <b>A</b> is intent on conveying an image of a sophisticated Parisian population rising above passions and showing a rational concern for their own interests, benefiting from the court at Versailles and having limited interest in ‘liberty’.</p> <p>In terms of <b>judgement</b>, probably both Sources are unreliable. The cahiers do not reveal antipathy to the institution of monarchy and arguably the king was popular for addressing abuses. However the events of 1789 do not confirm the picture of the Parisians painted in Source <b>A</b>, or the strength of the forces of repression. Candidates may see <b>B</b> as exaggerated, but may see events confirming the undermining of respect for monarchy. They may see the emergence of open revolutionary ideas in Paris by May 1789 as undermining the views of <b>A</b> or they may see that it was perceptive to talk of unrest in the poorer areas and that it was difficult to foresee, given previous repression of popular unrest, that government reactions to disorder in 1789 would be so limited.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus:</u>  <u>Comparison of two Sources</u>  No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for.....’  The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b>Sources B and C</b> see the importance of political agitation; <b>D and E</b> stress social and economic pressures. <b>A</b> does argue for the influence of some political ideas but questions their importance. NB If candidates make a distinction between political factors and political ideas/ideologies then this would be acceptable. Thus they may argue that political rights in <b>C</b> are distinct from the desire to bring about political reform. They may make a distinction between political writing and political agitation in <b>B</b>.</p> <p><b>B and C</b> see the expansion of political writing – <b>B</b> in a negative way in that new political demands undermine established institutions and bring crisis; <b>C</b> in a positive way in that they have awoken France from the sleep of despotism. <b>B</b> seems to relate the problem to the Assembly of Notables, but <b>C</b> to the American War, but it is the political effects that are emphasised. The provenance of this evidence is very different – <b>B</b> is from the Princes of the Blood anxious for the King to take a robust line in suppressing the tide of political debate. This could mean some exaggeration and a distorted view of what is actually 'treason'. <b>C</b> is from an ambassador with a very different perspective who welcomes the awakening of political consciousness. That these very different authors both think that there is significant political change may confirm the importance of the developments – or may question it as neither is entirely neutral and both, for their different reasons may over stress it. Jefferson was writing from Paris; the Princes also may have lacked a wider view. There is a new freedom of conversation and even the formation of what the ambassador calls a party – the Patriots. Though not a party in the modern sense- Jefferson may be exaggerating any coherence - this indicates that there was a body of opinion for reform and that political agitation cut through class barriers – something that became evident in 1789 when some nobles and lower clergy joined the Third Estate. Candidates may support this view of growing political agitation with knowledge of the spread of enlightenment ideas, with reference to the effects of the failure of the Assembly of Notables, of the ideas encouraged by the American War, by the growth of newspapers and publications. There may be some reference to the explosion of political ideas in Paris which accompanied the States General. Some however may be more sceptical given the emphasis on more concrete social and economic grievances in the Cahiers and may use <b>A</b> to support scepticism. However, this is a Paris-centred view from a journalist possibly anxious to show the realism and worldly sophistication of Parisians.</p> <p><b>D and E</b> offer evidence for social and economic factors in creating unrest. <b>Source A</b> also glancingly refers to 'talk of unrest in some poorer areas'. <b>D</b> refers to the lower class hatred of the privileges of the nobility, a point reinforced by <b>E</b> which refers to calls for the end of seigneurial dues (and possibly by <b>B</b> whose defence of privileges may explain resentment at an obdurate privileged class). The key idea in <b>D</b> is the resentment of the middle classes of the social dominance of the nobles, a matter of social attitudes rather than specific political demands. This is a view of an aristocrat in retrospect, having seen the effects of the Revolution on his class, but there is corroborating evidence that the middle classes were aware of the disparity between their wealth and status – for example, Sieyès' famous pamphlet</p>	70	<p><u>Focus:</u>  <u>Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</u>          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>'What is the Third Estate?'. What may be less typical is the awareness of the nobility of the disparity, especially as <b>B</b> continues to support it. The middle classes were excluded from higher office, There may be knowledge about the commercial expansion of France which tended to widen the gap between nobles and the middle classes; some might say that it was political ideas which increased the awareness of the iniquities of privileges. <b>E</b> focuses on the effects of harvests and food prices seen as the background to the calling of the States General. The view is that economic crisis 'focused the discontents of the Revolution' and despite <b>A</b>, this can be seen in the agitations in poor areas of Paris in 1789 and in the continuation of rural unrest in the summer. Candidates may well expand on the inability of the state to modify tax and legal privileges, the prevalence of social and economic issues in the Cahiers and the financial implications of privilege which linked to political agitations. <b>A</b> might again be used as a qualifying piece of evidence: the economic prosperity generated in Paris by the court and its spending must be taken into account and in fact <b>Source E</b> concentrates on provincial discontent. However, the growth of Paris's population and the vulnerability of its poor to higher prices is not really touched on in <b>A</b> and would support <b>E</b>. However, <b>E</b> could be challenged on the grounds that economic discontent alone might not lead to a revolutionary situation: rural unrest and high prices were not uncommon in the eighteenth century and did not lead to revolution except in conjunction with other factors.</p> <p>The evidence can clearly be used to either support or reject the interpretation. It could be pointed out that <b>Sources A, B and C</b> come from politicians and journalists who see unrest in political terms. Nonetheless they were all contemporary and in a position to know. <b>Sources D and E</b> are written in hindsight, perhaps more aware of social and economic factors, although <b>D</b> was himself an aristocrat who lived through the revolution. Many of the ideas referred to in <b>B</b> had been current before 1788. The key financial crisis which was the trigger for calling the Estates General was a product of the privilege outlined in <b>D</b> and without the economic downturn the unrest might not have pushed the political crisis of 1789 forward.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>The sources agree on several points. In <b>Source B</b> Mazzini claims to have known that Italians ‘would promise to act but would do nothing’, suggesting they had good intentions but had failed to achieve anything. <b>Source D</b> says much the same as ‘few are prepared to act’. Also, <b>Source D</b> thinks it is a deceit to think ‘the people will unite’, a point accepted in <b>Source B</b> as Mazzini thinks ‘they are prepared to be defeated one by one’, implying they lack co-ordination. Thirdly, in <b>Source B</b> Mazzini accepts that ‘a rising does not look likely’ and <b>Source D</b> concedes ‘The people do not want a revolution’. There are differences. Mazzini, in <b>Source B</b>, argues that Italians ‘need an organisation’, to ‘draw up a plan, then tell them to act’ but this is contested in <b>Source D</b> which argues Italians ‘depend on the support of other social superiors not revolutionary organisations’. The sources seem to differ on future prospects of support from Italians for unification. In <b>Source B</b> Mazzini is pessimistic – ‘Italians will never come together to create a united country’ – whereas <b>Source D</b> implies the time will come but not ‘until the people are ready’.</p> <p>In evaluating the provenance emphasis is likely on the context and audience of the sources. Mazzini was writing after several reverses for his Young Italy movement, the most immediate of which was the failure of the Bandiera brothers to excite revolution in Calabria in 1844 (unlikely to be known by most candidates). There had been setbacks in Piedmont in the 1830s, too, and by the time of writing it is unsurprising that Mazzini should despair at the failure of Italians to unite in revolution. The authors of <b>Source D</b> were writing after the failure of the revolutions of 1848–49 had exposed various problems in galvanising Italians to support the cause of unification which had undermined belief in Mazzini’s ‘Italia fara da se’. In addition, by 1858 the National Society had just been established and many nationalists had adopted different strategies to those of Mazzini even if they shared his political views, as was the case with the authors of <b>Source D</b>. This may account for the difference in tone between the sources. <b>Source B</b> is bitter and rather pessimistic (‘there will be nothing left for me’) in light of the setbacks mentioned whereas <b>Source D</b> is more equable in tone, tolerant of Italian weaknesses and optimistic about the future, looking to embrace all to the cause. Both sources were private letters, the reliability of which might be assumed from the content and the person to whom they were sent. Mazzini was writing to a fellow insurrectionist who had experienced disappointment earlier, who was in exile like Mazzini and who might be expected to empathise with Mazzini’s frustration. The authors of <b>Source D</b> are even handed in their assessment recognising the weakness of the Italian cause but also the ‘strength’ that Mazzini could still contribute to the cause.</p> <p>In making a <b>judgement</b> candidates might stress the sincerity of both sources. The later date of <b>Source D</b> might be considered important in assessing its utility given the events from 1831 to 1858.</p>	30	<p><b>Focus:</b>  <u>Comparison of two Sources.</u>  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
(b)	<p><b>Sources C and E</b> are the most supportive of the interpretation with <b>Sources B and D</b> lending some weight to it. The interpretation is challenged by <b>Source A</b> in particular but also <b>Sources B and D</b> and <b>Source E</b> provides a hint of criticism of Mazzini.</p> <p>Trevelyan's account (<b>Source C</b>) is effusive in its praise of Mazzini. It claims that 'Throughout the Peninsula groups of young men had been roused by Mazzini's appeal' who exuded charisma by his looks and 'voice'. When in office during the Roman Republic he inspired citizens 'to behave admirably' and his 'personal influence' is stressed as considerable. The 'love' he inspired was such that the French 'dared not arrest him'. However, the author acknowledges that Mazzini had enemies who accused him of 'exercising so hateful a tyranny'. It is clear that, for the author, these people were a minority and the accusation of tyranny a falsehood. Candidates may regard the source as balanced by admitting there was criticism of Mazzini but others may argue otherwise given the reverence with which Mazzini is described as 'divine'. Knowledge of the regime of the triumvirate in Rome might be deployed to assess the veracity of this source. Some may also know that Trevelyan, an English liberal and whig historian, was a known supporter of unification, itself a British liberal ideal. His historical view is a slanted one.</p> <p><b>Source E</b> pays tribute to the idealism of Mazzini, in particular, 'the hope that Italy singlehanded could defeat the tyrants' and 'become a strong nation'. Cross reference to <b>Source C</b> is possible in the way 'young men' are identified as those prepared to risk 'death or exile' in pursuit of Mazzinian idealism. The author clearly feels Mazzini's contribution deserves to be recognised by allowing him back into the country. However, it might be argued that this was hardly surprising given the author was a Republican, like Mazzini. Nonetheless, the reference to the context of Mazzini winning a seat in Parliament implies he had popular support, in a certain constituency at least. Indeed, candidates may know that Mazzini had been elected to Parliament in previous elections too.</p> <p>There is evidence in <b>Source D</b> to support the interpretation. Despite falling out with Mazzini the authors concede they 'still share your political views' which suggests the influence of Mazzini was long lasting or deep rooted as far as they were concerned. In addition, the Source implies that Mazzini enjoyed wider support, at least at an earlier time, in order for him to 'lose prestige and followers' by the time the letter was written. Indeed, the authors seem to recognise the 'strength' of Mazzini and his ability to inspire in urging him to continue to work for the cause. Given that the authors have disagreed with Mazzini their testimony may be considered reliable and therefore useful as evidence for the inspiration Mazzini provided. <b>Source B</b> claims there was a need to 'create illusions and inspire confidence' which Young Italy was designed to do. However, this is less than reliable in proving Mazzini managed to do this as the record of Young Italy was poor, acknowledged by Mazzini, his claim was more a statement of belief than practice.</p>	70	<p><u>Focus:</u>  <u>Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u>          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>However, some of the points raised above could also be used to indicate the limited influence of Mazzini. Such influence that he had could be said to be on the wane. <b>Source D</b> also suggests that he lacked support for his ideas, plans and ‘revolutionary organisations’ from the people and from ‘most republicans’ in particular. Writing in 1858 it could be argued that this was a fair reflection of opinion at a time when Piedmont had assumed leadership of the national cause and whose relations with Mazzini were strained to say the least. Cross reference to <b>Source E</b> might be made here. In the latter the notion of ‘Italia fara de se’ is referred to but support for this strategy was extremely limited after 1848-49. Indeed, <b>Source E</b> also refers to only ‘some young men who shared his (Mazzini’s) hopes’ indicating Mazzini’s influence should not be exaggerated. Also, the introduction to <b>Source E</b> makes it clear that the majority of politicians in Parliament did not feel any obligation to Mazzini for they refused him his seat amongst them.</p> <p><b>Source A</b> is most explicit in refuting the interpretation. He is highly critical of Young Italy in terms of its ‘principles’, ‘methods’ and ‘leaders’. The short-comings of each led him to judge Young Italy to be ‘the perfect futility’. His reference to the imperative ‘to form the Italian mind’ to shape the nation suggests he placed emphasis on peaceful methods, not revolution as did Mazzini. Candidates may question the significance of this evidence as the author was an aristocrat and Prime Minister of Piedmont at a time shortly after the war of 1848-49 in which Piedmont, alone, had been defeated by Austria. Mazzini’s attempts to raise insurrection in Piedmont in the 1830s might also have coloured the views of the author against Mazzini. Writing after the sequence of events from 1859 that led to the unification of Italy it is not surprising that the author is dismissive of Mazzini whose role in shaping those events was, surely, peripheral.</p> <p>Mazzini’s testimony in <b>Source B</b> is likely to be regarded as reliable evidence of the lack of inspiration Mazzini provided. The self-critical nature of the source admits to the lack of success of Young Italy (cross reference to <b>Source A</b> might be attempted to verify the reliability of the latter) and he fears ‘there will be nothing left for me but to write a curse on Italians’. It might be argued that this is merely the modesty of a humble man (cross reference to <b>Source C</b> and ‘Mazzini’s virtue’ might be made) or the despair of the moment although this ignores the fact that many attempts at revolution since 1831 were inspired by Mazzini and Young Italy.</p> <p>In judgement candidates could argue for or against the interpretation depending on how they used the evidence. It might be argued that Mazzini was an inspiration more in the earlier years of the process of unification until his ideas were exposed as flawed by events, notably the idea of ‘Italia fara de se’.</p>		



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>These sources are largely in agreement on the issue of the extension of slavery but there are differences on matters of detail. Both agree that the people of the land concerned should decide, by their election of their representatives, whether to admit slavery or not. In <b>Source B</b> the final sentence makes that clear and in <b>Source E</b> it is stated that ‘if the people are opposed to slavery they will elect representatives who will by unfriendly legislation effect a change’. Consistent with this position both sources discount the right of federal institutions to determine the matter. <b>Source B</b> argues that Congress might impose restrictions on a Territory but ‘they are not binding upon her as a State’ and in <b>Source E</b> it is clearly stated that ‘no matter what the decision of the Supreme Court’ this cannot override the wishes of the people. However, the sources appear to differ on the point at which the people can decide. <b>Source B</b> seems to make a distinction between a Territory and a State arguing that the people can decide the issue only when a State has been created but not as a Territory. However, <b>Source E</b> is equally clear that a decision is possible whilst the land is a Territory. These positions are made clear in the first and last sentences of both sources. There is another point of difference. In <b>Source B</b> it is argued that the justification for the people to determine whether slavery is adopted or not is ‘the principles of State rights’. However, <b>Source E</b> emphasises the practicality of whether or not the decision of the people can be implemented: hence the reference to the imperative of ‘local police regulations’.</p> <p>The provenance can be evaluated on several grounds. <b>Source B</b> was published before the Nebraska Bill was actually made law and is based more on principle and the objectives of the Bill. It is idealistic in claiming the Bill ‘forever sets at rest a divisive question’ quickly exposed as misguided by the eruption of violence in Kansas. By contrast, the author of <b>Source E</b> was speaking after the civil war in Kansas, the Dred Scott decision and the Lecompton Constitution and his views will have been informed by these events. The authorship is important. Michigan was a mid-North State not directly affected by the issue of slavery which might account for its moderate and optimistic tone. It admits to regarding the Nebraska bill ‘like the Compromise Measures (of 1850) as common ground upon which all sections can meet’ which is a generous view to say the least. Douglas is equally misleading in so far as he ignores the election cheating in Nebraska which compromised the political process there. The audiences of the authors are different. The newspaper (<b>Source B</b>) is trying to explain a complicated Bill to its readers and this might explain its simplicity whereas Douglas, in <b>Source E</b>, is responding to Lincoln, a critic of the Bill, and may be regarded as an attempt by the sponsor of the Bill to defend his position. In making a <b>judgement</b> some candidates may argue this indicates <b>Source E</b> to be less than reliable. However, the views expressed by Douglas were consistent with the arguments he presented during the debate on the Bill. Equally, whilst <b>Source B</b> appears to be merely</p>	30	<p><u>Focus:</u>  <u>Comparison of two Sources.</u>  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
(b)	<p>outlining the terms of the Bill in a detached manner it is, in fact, less typical of journalistic opinion in the North as <b>Source E</b> indicates.</p> <p><b>Sources A, C and D</b> could be grouped as supportive of the interpretation with <b>Sources B and E</b> offering a counter argument. However, the cartoon might be regarded as ambiguous.</p> <p><b>Source A</b> advocates violence in defence of the right to hold slaves. This is stressed in the references to ‘rifles’, ‘bayonets’ and ‘blood’. It is insistent that slavery be allowed in Nebraska arguing the right of ‘American citizens ... to go where they please ... with their property’ (including ‘their Negroes’) and to secure the ‘repeal of the odious Missouri Compromise’. His uncompromising stance is made clear in the refrain that he ‘would sooner see the whole of Nebraska in the bottom of Hell than see it as a Free State’ and the imperative of preventing ‘the vermin of the North’ from taking over Nebraska. Overall, his remarks indicate a clear divide between North and South and give the impression he is prepared to risk the integrity of the Union. The bellicose tone of the speech might be explained by the intention behind it which was effectively a ‘call to arms’ and perhaps an exaggeration of his true views. However, the author was notorious as ‘a firebrand’ and candidates may know that in the subsequent civil war he encouraged the ‘border ruffians’ and that he was personally engaged in many brutal actions, for example, the sack of Lawrence in May 1856. Yet as a southern senator, his views on the Union carry weight, especially given later events.</p> <p>In contrast the views of Northerners are considered in <b>Source C</b> and they might be considered just as dangerous to the Union. Northern papers are said to be ‘bitter and seething with resentment’ and, crucially, ‘proclaim the renewal of war to the death upon the South’. Moreover, <b>Source C</b> recognises the stimulus given to the abolitionist movement by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, claiming it is ‘stronger than ever’. Further, the article anticipates that force will be needed to ‘execute the Fugitive Slave Law’, and that ‘peace ... is at an end’. As a Southern perspective this source is fairly candid about the impact of the Bill and may be considered reliable given the context, especially if cross referenced to A. The Fugitive Slave Law had created many problems since 1850 and the Burns case in the same year as the Source was written may help explain its views. Further, its prophesy of war was accurate given the civil war which followed in Kansas. Candidates may know something of the horrors perpetrated by those who supported slavery in the fighting of 1856. The political impact on the Democrats and Whigs mentioned in the final sentence could be examined as the Democrats, at least, now split North and South with implications later for the division of the country from which the threat to the Union in 1860, it might be argued, emerged.</p>	70	<p><u>Focus:</u>  <u>Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u>          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 cartoon (<b>Source D</b>) could be cross-referenced with both <b>Sources A</b> and <b>C</b>. Like <b>Source A</b> it shows Southerners who favoured slavery, represented by the whip in his belt, prepared to be aggressive with the dagger and pistol. The intention is clearly to wound the North, at least, and, with the left leg, to bring the latter down. The implication is that the 'UNION' by which they are joined is at risk. Indeed, it might be argued that the North is pushing the South away with similar intent to break the Union or is holding it at arms length: links with <b>Source C</b> might be made. However, it might be thought that the North is merely restraining the South with the intention of upholding the Union. Indeed, the North seems more virtuous (unarmed) and strong enough to withstand the South (upright, with the left hand disarming the South). As an English cartoon it might be said to provide a neutral insight into the views of outsiders. On the other hand, the Northern 'twin' looks more heroic and the Southern 'twin' is portrayed as manic and less worthy of sympathy which might be regarded as an indication of the animosity of the English to slavery. Knowledge of attitudes in both Sections could be used to inform the answer about the importance of the Union to the North and the South but that elements in the South favoured separation as in 1832-33 and later in 1860-61.</p> <p><b>Sources B</b> and <b>E</b> provide evidence to counter the interpretation arguing that disputes in Kansas-Nebraska were not a threat to the Union. Indeed, whether before the Bill of 1854 (<b>Source B</b>) or after the civil war in Kansas (<b>Source E</b>) these sources suggest that disputes in the region concerned were, if anything, going to be resolved with no hint of danger to the Union. This might be accounted for by the hope of those in <b>Source B</b> who anticipated the Bill being debated at the time would result in an outcome that would satisfy all. After all, it suggests the Bill provided a settlement and 'any demands more than is granted in this plan ... is preposterous' and that 'the Bill for Nebraska ... is common ground upon which all sections can meet'. It might be argued that the positive tone of <b>Source E</b> is in part because the civil war in Kansas did not break the Union. However gruesome the war may have been, it was contained to a limited area and there was little prospect of it engulfing the Union as a whole. Perhaps the claims of <b>Source E</b> that the Bill was a 'perfect' means by which the question of a Territory being slave or free could be decided was a little exaggerated but not surprising as the author had sponsored the Bill.</p> <p>In forming a judgement candidates may argue the evidence is inconclusive and compromised by the respective positions of the authors, although <b>B</b> is more measured for its northern audience. Some sources, if not all, do support the interpretation. The reliability and utility of the sources will need to be taken into account in weighing the evidence. If selected and deployed carefully the application of knowledge could be helpful in reaching a conclusion.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)	<p>The Sources are <b>similar</b> in that the methods and approach of Hitler are moderate. <b>Source C</b> says that there is no mention of hatred of the opposition or racial ideology and <b>Source E</b> confirms this. The Sources also agree about the respect Hitler displayed for Hindenburg, although it could be debated as to how genuine this was, particularly given his comment in the final sentence of <b>Source E</b>. There is an element of play-acting in both sources. Both sources agree on ceremony and formality as methods following the March 1933 election. <b>Source C</b> comments on the deliberately wrought emotion generated at the Day of Potsdam (the emotion of the radio announcer; the cheering millions, the symbolism of Potsdam on a legitimate link to Prussian glory and the Kaiser Reich). <b>Source E</b> supports this in its reference to the importance of Hindenburg's blessing for the new government. Both sources stress Hitler's concern to appear statesmanlike, <b>Source C</b> confirming the success of such methods referred to as important by Hitler in <b>Source E</b>. In both sources he acts constitutionally, deferring to Hindenburg as President of the Weimar Republic. Both share a tone of unity with no mention in public of methods that were less than constitutional. Hitler in <b>Source E</b> specifically ruled out any illegal seizure of power</p> <p>The Sources also <b>differ</b>. <b>Source C</b> has some hints that there is not total unity in Germany in the attitude to Hitler and reluctant admiration for his speech and emotional appeal. <b>Source E</b> is more practically based and makes it clear that Hitler was using the circumstances to his advantage and did not expect universal approval. This source is more aware of the political reality as opposed to the ceremonial master-minded by Goebbels which is the focus of <b>Source C</b>. The sources differ in that the methods appear legitimate in <b>Source C</b>, while <b>Source E</b> admits that such legitimacy is a facade to gain power. Then Hitler will act against the opposition – 'only then could I overcome the opposition of all other parties'. There are references to later 'illegality' and violence – the Rohm Putsch and the Night of the Long Knives. <b>Source E</b> also mentions that Hindenburg and the Conservatives were playing a game – Hitler was appointed only because there was no way out.</p> <p>The <b>provenance</b> and <b>context</b> of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. <b>Source C</b>, being after the Reichstag Fire and two days before the vote on the Enabling Act, could show that Hitler's early appeal had not diminished and he was even on the way to winning over former opponents by his moderate methods, crucial if he was to gain the two thirds majority needed to change the Weimar constitution. His attitude of deference to Hindenburg was very popular. Candidates may feel this was not genuine and could use <b>Source E</b> in discussing this aspect. <b>Source C</b> has further information, about Goebbels' ability, even in 1934, to organise splendid spectacle, which aroused the emotions of the spectators and even those listening on the radio, another of his propaganda machines. <b>Source E</b>, when Hitler was looking back on his triumphs, shows his appreciation that he needed to use moderation and legality to win over Hindenburg and the Reichstag and to pre-empt possible resistance from the army, the one body which could overthrow him forcibly. Candidates might feel that Hitler's considered views on his methods would be more useful, or they could argue that he was using hindsight to give himself credit for his actions.</p>	30	<p>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</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. 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 <b>supporting</b> view, that consent was the main factor, is found in <b>Sources C and D</b>, and in part <b>Sources A and E</b> (Hitler appealing for popular consent and legitimacy), while the <b>opposing</b> view, that there are other explanations, is outlined in Sources <b>A, B, D and E</b>.</p> <p>The <b>supporting</b> view in <b>Source C</b> shows popular adulation for Hitler in a report from from a liberal family, not the most obvious supporters of Hitler. ‘Cheering millions’ is an exaggeration from the radio commentator but clearly there was much backing for the Chancellor as to be expected from the stage-management of the Day of Potsdam and its timing. <b>Source D</b>, also from a source which would be hostile to Hitler, the Social Democrats in exile, shows that even after the Night of the Long Knives, Hitler was still admired in Saxony and Bavaria, for his decisive action and his honourable aims. The latter presumably attracted the crowds in <b>Source C</b>. He commands their consent, albeit for violence (removal of Marscists and the curbing of the SA). In <b>Source A</b>, although propaganda, Hitler bids for consent on a programme of unity, the protection of Christianity and family, although this is not to include communism. In <b>E</b>, perhaps more reliably, he again stresses the importance of acting constitutionally, thereby giving consent.</p> <p>The <b>opposing</b> view is partly from the pen or mouth of Hitler himself and he is more inclined to argue that his programme and his tactics were what brought him to power and kept him there. In <b>Source A</b> he outlines a basic set of principles, notably thin in detail, and including thinly veiled threats to opponents, especially the SPD and KPD for whom ‘old traditions’ were anathema. In <b>Source E</b> when he is looking back, at a time when WWII was not yet at crisis point, he admires his own methods of achieving power in 1933 and his exploitation of Hindenburg. But his explanation is not necessarily rendered unreliable as his decision to seek power legally was a contributor to his success and his need to placate the army was clear. <b>Source B</b> shows that there were dissenting voices and that suppression of political opposition was what allowed Hitler to consolidate power. It is strong evidence for a counter view based on violence at a very early stage, less than two months after his appointment, and is supported by the reference to murder in <b>Source D</b> which refers to earlier socialist arrests and to those killed during the Night of the Long Knives.</p> <p>The <b>provenance</b> and <b>context</b> of the Sources should be integrated into the discussion. <b>Sources A and E</b> are Hitler himself. In 1933 he is wisely non-committal in his suggested programme, having on that day become Chancellor. Candidates may spot that sources <b>B and C</b> are on the same day, and they can contrast the public attempts at acquiring consent on the Day of Potsdam with the reality of the new makeshift concentration camps in <b>Source B</b>. Candidates could discuss how popular the programme</p>	70	<p>Focus: Judgement in context based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</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</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>was or whether many Germans had only a vague idea about what Hitler really stood for. He is certainly aiming for consent. <b>Source E</b> might be seen as more reliable as an explanation of how Hitler came to power with his accurate reading of the situation in 1933 and his recognition of the role of the political impasse which had been reached as a result of the scheming of figures like Schleicher and von Papen. Although <b>Sources C and D</b> come from people or groups hostile to Hitler, they outline the success of Hitler in achieving consent. The stage-management of Goebbels, the cheering crowds and the partial radio commentator are all factors which candidates can develop as means of achieving the appearance of popular consent. <b>Source C</b> hints at one of Hitler's other assets, his speaking skills. The respect Hitler shows for Hindenburg was mirrored to some extent in <b>Source E</b>, although candidates could consider whether calling Hindenburg the Old Gentleman is a token of esteem or faintly mocking. It underlines the importance of gaining the President's 'consent'. <b>Source D</b> shows that even when faced with a contrary view, Germans in Saxony and Bavaria defended Hitler and that the restoration of order and removal of Communists was important to them and could be used to justify his actions. At this point the terror structure of the state was not in full swing so these are probably genuine views. The actions described in <b>Source B</b> would thus have some support within Germany, especially given the emphasis on national security, but candidates are likely to argue that this is an official view and so not inherently reliable without some backing. Thus <b>Sources A,C and E</b> stress the importance Hitler gave to the achievement of consent and are both public and private reactions, one from a potentially liberal opponent. However, they refer to the immediate period in the two months following Hitler's appointment when he was still operating within the structure of the Weimar Republic. Thus <b>Sources A,B and C</b> are about firstly winning the March election and even more so a two-thirds Reichstag majority to subvert Weimar in the Enabling Act tabled on 23<sup>rd</sup> March 1933. <b>Source D</b> refers to 1934 when the third Reich was well established. Candidates could instead point to the use of force and violence in <b>Source B and D</b> to consolidate power.</p>		<p>the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (a)	<p>The <b>contents</b> of the Sources appear to have fewer <b>similarities</b> than differences, but there are some similarities. They <b>agree</b> that the Geneva Settlement brought peace and subsequent foreign aid and moral encouragement. <b>Both</b> refer to the South Vietnamese economy, independence and democracy, law and administration. Both Diem and the South Vietnamese businessmen claim to be acting in the interests of a strong economy and independence.</p> <p>The <b>contents</b> of the Sources reveal many <b>differences</b> in opinion. In <b>Source C</b>, Diem takes a negative view of the Geneva settlement of 1954, focusing on the division of Vietnam, its acceptance of communist rule in the north and stresses the problems resulting from the settlement, such as an influx of Catholic refugees to the south. The businessmen in <b>Source E</b> take a more positive view of the Geneva settlement and its promise for the future. The Sources take an opposite view regarding the economic situation in South Vietnam. Diem in <b>Source C</b> claims he inherited serious economic problems such as a crumbling economy and empty treasury, and claims the credit for building a free economy, whereas the businessmen in <b>Source E</b> stress the benefits of fertile soil and fishing surpluses which provided a base for economic growth which he has failed to achieve. This difference might be explained using <b>provenance</b>. In <b>Source C</b>, Diem is telling his US audience what they wish to hear, and implies containment of communism. The businessmen in <b>Source E</b>, especially those who are ex-government ministers, have no reason to lie about economic advantages and are in a good position to know economic trends. In <b>Source C</b>, Diem speaks of political problems which hindered the creation of an independent modern state, 'a bankrupt political system and disorganised administration' and takes credit for turning around a seeming hopeless inherited situation. In <b>Source E</b>, the South Vietnamese businessmen are patriotic, pro-independence and democracy, but see Diem as anti-democratic and oppressive, denying freedom of speech and fulfilment of the political will of the people. In <b>Source C</b>, Diem denies that he will abandon freedom. On the other hand, in <b>Source E</b> the businessmen claim that the Diem government rides roughshod over the law and the jails are full, whereas Diem claims to have achieved political stability and internal security. In <b>Source C</b>, Diem claims to have restored external security, i.e. contained communism to the north, whereas in <b>Source E</b> the businessmen claim that new oppressive groups, who have replaced the sects Diem complains about in <b>Source C</b>, do not protect South Vietnam from communism. Diem in <b>Source C</b> claims to have prevented South Vietnam 'being engulfed in anarchy' yet <b>Source E</b> refers to people wanting 'freedom, democracy and the right to express themselves without fear'. Thus, the situation according to Diem in <b>Source C</b> is one of positive achievement by his government thanks to US aid, whereas <b>Source E</b> has a negative view of Diem's repressive regime.</p>	30	<p>Focus: a comparison of Sources</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
5	<p>(b) In <b>provenance</b>, the <b>Sources</b> are similar, as both have South Vietnamese authorship and some of the authors of <b>Source E</b> are ex-government ministers. In <b>Source C</b>, Diem's public address to the US Council on Foreign Relations in New York is self-congratulatory propaganda, seeing only his positive achievements, as its purpose is to secure continuing US aid to strengthen his minority Catholic regime in South Vietnam. On the other hand <b>Source E</b> is a public document written by critics of their own government with the purpose of holding Diem's government to its promises and pointing out its failures. Their manifesto is, in effect, an attempt to act as an unofficial government opposition, a normal part of any democratic system based on free speech. The steer to <b>Source E</b>, explaining the outcome of their action, is useful evidence of Diem's repressive regime and confirms their views. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to evaluate which view is more convincing. Diem's refusal to allow free elections was in line with US policy of preventing communist control in South Vietnam. In <b>Source C</b>, Diem claims to have dealt with the problems of armed sects and refugees from the North, but knowledge of his repression of communists and Buddhists might be used. The self-immolation of the monk, Thich Quang Duc, might be cited, although this occurred in Saigon 6 years later. The corruption of Diem and his family might be used to extend <b>Source C</b>. In contrast, <b>Source E</b> might be seen as more useful and reliable as it is not concerned with the north, and is a more credible view of the situation, as confirmed by knowledge and the fate of its authors. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</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. The Sources may be grouped by their view. <b>Sources A, B and C</b> support the interpretation, although they are not wholly convincing or reliable. In contrast, <b>Sources D and E</b> oppose the interpretation despite their opposite political affiliations, thus their common views become more convincing when used together.</p> <p>The <b>positive argument</b> that US support for Diem aided the development of an independent democracy in Vietnam is in <b>Sources A, B and C</b> to an extent. <b>Source A</b> is Eisenhower's offer of US aid to Diem and his purpose is to 'contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam' 'responsive to the needs of its people'. Thus it is useful as evidence for US intentions in supporting Diem and may be linked with <b>Source B</b>, which emphasises the national nature of the security system which Eisenhower wishes to support – 'a Vietnamese force', 'to train the native forces', 'under Diem's command'. <b>Source C</b>, likewise, emphasises the creation of an independent, modern state and the restoration of political stability. In <b>Source C</b> Diem claims to be establishing political stability, freedom and independence in South Vietnam in line with US policy, and addresses the Council for Foreign Relations in New York to</p>		



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>state his achievements. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to confirm that this positive image of Diem was current in the US press – eg he was portrayed as the ‘Tough Miracle Man of South Vietnam’ by Life Magazine. Evaluation of reliability might suggest this was propaganda – as the place, nature and audience of his speech also indicates. It might be inferred that his purpose was to increase US aid for his corrupt regime. In fact, <b>Sources A and B</b> might be seen to reveal US reservations about supporting Diem. <b>Source A</b> sets out, very clearly and idealistically, US requirements in giving support. Diem must be ‘responsive to the national aspirations’, enlightened’, effective’ and ‘respected at home and abroad’. The implication is that Eisenhower has misgivings about Diem governing in this way and needs to instruct him. This suggests the US is using Diem as a puppet ruler for their own purposes rather than aiding an independent democracy in Vietnam. <b>Source C</b> is unreliable, as Diem hides the negative aspects of his rule, such as the refusal to hold free elections and dependence on armed repression. <b>Source B</b> confirms the US already knew this, as the NSC report fears that Diem ‘could be down the drain with no replacement in sight’ without increased US military personnel and expenditure or Diem to ‘sustain <i>himself</i>. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to confirm that Diem, with US support, did not allow free and democratic elections for fear of the country re-uniting under communist control. <b>Sources A, B and C</b> thus reveal the underlying US priority to contain communist advance from North Vietnam and suggest that Vietnamese independence and democracy are not the main reason for US support for Diem. Therefore, <b>Sources A, B and C</b> are not fully convincing evidence in support of the interpretation.</p> <p>The <b>opposing</b> argument is strongly stated in <b>Sources D and E</b>, strengthened by evaluation of <b>Source C</b> as unconvincing propaganda. Both <b>Sources D and E</b> see Diem’s government as anti-democratic and repressive, working against national independence for Vietnam. The <b>provenance</b> of <b>Source D</b> might be seen to make it politically unreliable, as it is Le Duan’s appeal for Hanoi to support South Vietnamese communists in a military struggle against a US-backed Diem government in the South. <b>Source D</b> might be seen as typical of communist views that the USA was following an imperialist policy in South East Asia. However, <b>Source D</b> might be cross-referenced with <b>Source E</b> to confirm that both communist <i>and</i> pro-democracy southern patriots agreed on the repressive nature of Diem’s regime. It might be suggested that these Sources are evidence for US interference undermining any chance of an independent democracy in Vietnam by propping up a repressive tyrant. On the other hand it might be argued, using Eisenhower’s comment in <b>Source A</b>, that US support for Diem was to ‘discourage any who wish to impose a foreign ideology’ on Vietnam and thus contained the spread of communism. The USA at least ensured that the whole country did not fall under Soviet or Chinese communist domination, destroying any hope of an independent democracy. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance of the groups of Sources as evidence here, there being no set conclusion.</p>	70	<p>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</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>

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2013

