

GCE

History A

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

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2015

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 2015

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

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
C	Grouping
Eval	Evaluation
S	Sequencing
Ju	Judgement
KU	Relevant contextual knowledge
P	Provenance used

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.

Here are the subject specific instructions for this question paper

Candidates should answer on only one Option. They should answer questions (a) and (b) on that Option. If they answer on more than one Option then the higher mark should be awarded. Do not allow marks across more than one option. If they answer on Q(a) comparing the wrong source or sources then no more than a high L6 mark can be awarded. If fewer than the 5 sources on Q(b) are used then the next level down from the one awarded otherwise awarded is given, although please use professional judgement here.

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>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>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>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>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>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>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>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>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>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>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>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>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>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>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
Total for each question = 70	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <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>
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p>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>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>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>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>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>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>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>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>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>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>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>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>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>0 – 6</p>

Here is the mark scheme for this question paper.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1 a	<p>The context is the aftermath of the Terror and the movement of the Convention towards establishing a more conservative Constitution with less power to the executive. The Thermidor period saw a relaxation of the extreme political tensions of the Terror. The National Guard suppressed the demonstrations of the Paris crowds in two journées in which the mobs were driven away from the Convention. The more serious demonstration was that of Prairial, but it was defeated and the radicals deported.</p> <p>Source B is a radical declaration and C is the response of a member of the Convention. Both are appealing for support, but one for revolution and the other for peace and stability. One wants to carry on with the revolution and one to bring peace and unity.</p> <p>Similarities: both deal with extremism. C refers to agitators ‘who want to tear us apart’ and B wants to abolish the Government. B states the desire to return to the Constitution of 1793 and C also refers to this. B refers to the hardship of people dying of hunger. C acknowledges ‘hardship’ and ‘sacrifice’.</p> <p>Differences: Unrest is blamed on the Government in B allowing people to die of hunger and being tyrannical, ruining and enslaving the people. C does not acknowledge this as a cause but rather agitation – both royalist and revolutionary, dishonouring the revolution. B is seeing unrest as a right and duty. There is no reference to royalists and priests causing unrest in B, unlike C. There is no reference to a desire to prevent peace with the allies as a cause in B, unlike C.</p> <p>Provenance – B is produced during the Prairial revolt and an attempt to win over the masses to revolutionary action; C is after the failure of the Revolt and an attempt to end</p>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus must be comparative. Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. • No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for.....’ (A02) • The comparison must be for the key Issue – as evidence for the reasons for unrest in 1795 If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded. • The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer. • Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation. • Provenance may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or ‘stock’. • Stand-alone knowledge is not rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use context to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse. • Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>further unrest. B does not disown the Revolution and puts a lot of blame, as a distraction and attempt to create unity, on royalists and priests. Given high food prices in Paris and the previous successes of action by the crowds, C is emotional and appeals to a revolutionary tradition and revolutionary rights. The liberty invoked in B is different. Both are using the Revolution for their different ends – one to protest about conditions and sustain the radicalism that has been overthrown; the other to portray the causes of unrest as essentially inimical to true revolutionary liberty.</p> <p>Judgement: B is useful for seeing that high food prices as still a mainspring of unrest and that radical ideas are still active in the Faubourgs as a cause of unrest. C is useful to seeing how the Convention portrayed the sections as undermining the true gains of the Revolution, but was careful to avoid blaming working class radicalism too much – shifting blame to the right. B is typical of the revolutionary appeals of the Paris Faubourgs; C is useful in seeing how the Convention was still seeing itself as revolutionary and putting the blame for unrest on the enemies of the revolution, not those who wanted it to help the poor.</p>		<p>is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and below for A02.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgements, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. Judgement on the topic rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone. • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. <p>The first section is to offer some guidance to the background. Candidates are not expected to include this.</p>
1	<p>b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouping – A, C and E provide evidence of unpopularity whereas B and D seem to show more continuity. • A and E see the radical revolution as unpopular. A stresses peace and the benefits of ‘normal’ life – safe roads, trade and stable government. There is no reference to fulfilling any revolutionary policies, but getting back to normal after civil war. As a peace treaty it may well gloss over continuing discord, but the willingness of the state to come to terms with rebels who had consistently opposed 	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question is to assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge a given interpretation. The focus must be on the sources, a use of their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate’s ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below. • A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>the revolution is in considerable contrast to the repression in the provinces during the Terror and might well show that the radicalism was unpopular by Spring 1795. A similar desire to end the excesses of revolution is seen in E. Though this was by a leading former revolutionary, the end of the radicals in 1794 is seen as bringing France back to hope and civilization. When radicalism ended pride was restored. However, this was a memory from the 1820s and it recalled the relief that the Terror had ended. This might have coloured views and explains the emotional tone of the opening sentences. Also it is the abuses of the revolution and not its basic ideas which are unpopular here – the underlying cause is seen as noble, and the pursuit of liberty a holy right.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vocabulary of the revolution is still in strong use, which is not the case in the provincial peace treaty in A. C is also appealing for peace and does link to A and E in its dislike of radical revolution which it sees as dishonouring the glory of the Revolution. The dislike of the royalists and clergy appears to link with the belief in the underlying values of the Revolution still being prevalent in 1795. However a member of the Convention just after the defeat of one of the outbreaks of revolutionary violence that Paris had been subject to since 1789 could not afford to be too dismissive of revolutionary ideas. However, as in A there is a desire to stop revolutionary war – this time between France and the allies, not a civil war. • B and D in their different ways see the Revolution as 		<p>expected. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise. • Bolt-on knowledge is not to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is unbalanced. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance). • It follows that knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01. • Evaluation of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below. • Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below. • To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the sources need to be grouped according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. Check that a grouping makes sense –

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>still continuing. B is a revolutionary declaration, typical of other declarations from the working class districts of Paris. It calls for the Constitution of 1793, the most radical and democratic. It speaks of Revolution as a sacred right and indeed duty in the language of the Jacobins. It demands the rights of the people for bread, a recurrent revolutionary theme. The radicals of the Paris Faubourgs may not have been typical of the country as a whole and their power was waning by 1795 as their easy suppression by the National Guard shows. Manifestos from radical Parisian leaders should not be seen as indicating that the Revolution had been discredited by the Terror and that the relief shown in C was not typical. D is another extreme declaration from the exiled brother of Louis XVI obviously disgusted by the revolution and seeing continuity between tyranny – even if the tyrants are weaker and less bloodthirsty than Robespierre and his supporters. The new rulers and the Convention are seen as having continuity with the revolution – in some ways supported by the loyalty to revolutionary ideas shown in E and C. However, the language used and the purpose of the document, i.e. to get support for restoration of the monarchy and to show the allies that a rapprochement with a moderate revolutionary France was a false policy make this an unreliable source. However, it is useful for seeing the unremitting hostility of the right and its desire to tar all revolutionaries with the same brush. No set answer is expected and indeed better answers may make a distinction between ‘revolution’ as an ideal and ‘revolution’ in practice.</p>		<p>candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A judgement based on the sources is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing or on the topic rather than the sources. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered. • Be impressed by cross reference within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach is usually awarded at Level 4 but do not apply inflexibly. • If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the sources to illustrate an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is referencing. • It is not necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement. Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded – do not mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of own knowledge, candidates may make reference to the Vendée uprising to put Source A in context. Likewise, the impact of the Thermidorean government's economic policy which led to widespread hardship could be used to support the points being made in Sources B and C. Awareness of the position of the émigrés might be expected for the context to Source D, as well as the fact that the exiled Louis XVIII was clearly making a play (unsuccessfully) to try to regain his throne and sow discord at a time of uncertainty. In this context, the description of Source D erroneously identifies the brother of Louis XVI (who became king as Louis XVIII) as the Duke of Artois. Candidates who repeat this error will obviously not be penalised. Source E may allow candidates to comment on the events of the Thermidorean reaction to suggest that, even if revolution still had an appeal, the excesses of the Terror no longer did. A limited amount of own knowledge is to be expected, but credit should be given for the effective use of such knowledge 		<p>and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
2	a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context is that there were revolutions between 1820 and 1849 in large areas of the Italian peninsula. Disturbances varied in scale, impact and the methods of revolutionaries. • Similarities. The sources confirm that the Carbonari was important, at least in the earlier years. In Source A it is described as ‘the most widespread’ and in Source B we are told it started in ‘Naples and Piedmont’ then ‘spread to Tuscany’. Both sources consider revolutionary groups to be organised. In Source A Canosa describes the ‘revolutionary rabble’ as ‘now organised like a profession and trade’ and in Source B Young Italy is described as a ‘brotherhood’ bringing revolutionaries in Modena, Bologna and Tuscany together. • Differences. According to Source A ‘the hub of revolutionary spirit is to be found in schools and universities’ where ‘professors ... corrupt the students’. However, in Source B, it appears that in many central Italian cities ‘revolutionaries came together wherever they could’. The impression given in Source A is that revolutionaries were active conspirators especially the ‘students who have always been the first to come out against the sovereigns’, and the reference to ‘hatching new plots’ suggests constant action. By contrast, in Source B we learn that the Carbonari, in Tuscany at least, did not cause ‘any open disturbance’. In addition, members of Young Italy ‘were concerned solely with discussing the way forward’ which reinforces the impression that revolutionary activity in the central regions was passive. • The Provenance. Candidates may stress the 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus must be comparative. Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. • No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for.....’ (A02) • The comparison must be for the key Issue – as evidence for revolutionary activity in the Italian peninsula. If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded. • The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer. • Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation. • Provenance may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or ‘stock’. • Stand-alone knowledge is not rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use context to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse. • Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>relationship of the authors as significant. Canosa was an outsider reliant on information about the Carbonari from his informers and security forces whereas Montanelli was an insider with first-hand experience of Young Italy. The position of the authors is also worth discussion. As chief minister to the King, Canosa was responsible for law and order and the safety of the realm. As such revolutionary groups were the enemy so it is unsurprising that he refers to them in derogatory language ('the treacherous revolutionary rabble') or to be hostile to universities as places of discussion and dissent. Similarly, in writing to the King it is understandable that he might dismiss the Carbonari as 'rabble' and to stress how it has been humiliated and defeated if only to reassure the King that he was worthy of his trust. Nonetheless, knowledge of Carbonari activity in Naples, specifically the uprising of 1820, could be deployed to verify Canosa's assessment. By contrast, Montanelli supported revolutionary activity and so might be expected to write positively about revolutionaries. The fact that he is critical of them suggests that his assessment of them is reliable. Indeed, given the failure of revolutions in the Central Duchies in 1830-31 and subsequent plots in the 1830s, Source B appears to be as reliable as Source A. Significantly, Canosa is writing at the height of Carbonari activity when the danger was very real which helps explain the tension in his memo whereas Montanelli is writing with the benefit of hindsight and personal disillusionment borne of considerable experience of failure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgement. Candidates are likely to conclude that revolutionary activity was limited which is 		<p>below for A02.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgements, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. Judgement on the topic rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone. • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>accurately portrayed in both sources. By evaluation, some might suggest that Source B is more useful as it is effectively a confession of failure from a revolutionary and that it is based on an assessment of the whole period whereas Source A is confined to Naples and the years 1815-22.</p>		
2	<p>b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sources that provide most support for this interpretation are A and D though Source E could also be used. Sources B, C, and E, with a hint of support in D, suggest that various weaknesses of the revolutionary movement were also important. • The case for government repression. In Source A it is clear that the security forces have monitored and kept in check revolutionaries for a considerable time boasting that ‘The police should continue to keep close control over various sects’. Indeed, the chief minister feels the authorities have the ascendancy as it is confident that ‘This is the moment to terrify and to throw into dismay the treacherous revolutionary rabble’. The implication is that repression has been successful to the point that revolutionaries are so weak that the police could deal them a fatal blow. It appears that repression in Naples and Sicily was the main reason for the failure of revolutions. Candidates might elaborate on the activities of the Neapolitan regime which was notorious for its repression. Even if the motives of Canosa are assessed in light of his political position, the fact is that the Carbonari had to operate in secret and that their attempts at revolution were easily contained. • In another part of the country – Lombardy - the forces of government repression are considered 	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question is to assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge a given interpretation. The focus must be on the sources, a use of their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate’s ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below. • A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise. • Bolt-on knowledge is not to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is unbalanced. Award a low L3 or below at

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>powerful enough to control revolutionaries (Source D). Here, the police are described as brutal and the Austrian army as ferocious. Detail is provided about the anticipated confiscation of arms following a police operation to check existing arms' permits with gunsmiths under increased pressure. In addition, police surveillance has been increased with 'The army of spies ... doubled' to the extent that 'People live in continual fear of being arrested even on the slightest excuse'. Candidates might be able to provide knowledge about the 'Metternich System' in operation throughout the Austrian Empire, so the assessment of conditions in Lombardy could be applied, directly, to Venetia too and, indirectly, to the Central Duchies which were ruled by members of the Austrian royal family. Similarly, the reference to Radetsky could be developed to explain the presence of Austrian troops in Lombardy and Venetia and the fact that they had been deployed earlier, in 1821 and 1831, to suppress revolutions in various parts of the peninsula. So, knowledge of the context and history of the period would be an effective way to verify the accuracy and reliability of the source. Given Source D was a letter to a friend, candidates may argue this reinforces its reliability. Indeed, given the censorship and practice of intercepting the mail in Lombardy it might be argued that government repression must have been as extensive as it is described because Torelli must have thought the risks worth taking so urgent was the need to address the situation. Conversely, some might argue that the appeal for Piedmontese help in the final sentence may explain the bleakness of the picture penned by Torelli and the</p>		<p>A02 (according to severity of imbalance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It follows that knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01. • Evaluation of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below. • Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below. • To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the sources need to be grouped according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. Check that a grouping makes sense – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made. • A judgement based on the sources is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing or on the topic rather than the sources. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered. • Be impressed by cross reference within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>advantage of exaggerating the problem to gain sympathy in Piedmont. Even so, this merely underlines the extent of the repression the author wishes to remove.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The case against the effectiveness of repression. In Source D there is the suggestion that government repression was, in fact, counter-productive. It implies that the intensification of the repression at the time of writing aroused opposition to the extent that 'I could never have believed that hatred could spread everywhere so fast'. • Other factors that explain the failure of Italian revolutionaries include their division. In Source B it is stated that 'Young Italy was a coalition of potential revolutionaries divided in their opinions on politics and religion'. Knowledge of the differing views of organisations like Young Italy (Mazzinian) and the Carbonari as well as thinkers like Mazzini, Balbo and Gioberti would be instructive. Indeed, the latter, in Source C, places emphasis on the problem of leadership, conceding that 'some great men' were 'produced by her revolutions' but that they were let down by others. The interest of Gioberti in promoting the Pope as the leader of a federal state could be assessed as well as reference to examples such as Santarosa to gauge the reliability of Source C. In addition, Source C refers to the masses as a major problem inhibiting revolution. In this case they are described as unruly, though some might argue that this is more a criticism of leaders who lacked the authority to impose themselves on the people. Montanelli and Gioberti criticise revolutionary leaders who talk too much ('concerned solely with discussing the way forward') and for the mistaken strategy of trying to 		<p>to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but do not apply inflexibly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the sources to illustrate an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is referencing. • It is not necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement. • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded – do not mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>use the Pope as ‘an instigator of violent revolution’. Certainly, the lack of sufficient support is borne out by Sources B and E. The former admits that ‘Stories of thousands of imaginary combatants were based on hearsay’. In Source E the witness bemoans the futility of the activities of revolutionaries. She accuses them of being ‘silent and cowardly’ and she accuses them of lacking the commitment to the cause explaining that they first ousted the Grand Duke but, later, welcomed his return (‘The bells in the church rang for both’ and the ‘revolutionaries first planted a tree of liberty ... and then they pulled it down’). Her confidence in revolutionaries elsewhere is low. Her views on events in Rome may be regarded as ambivalent but overall she declares her ‘faith in all Italians is, however, nearly tired out’. Candidates may provide knowledge about events in Rome and may refer to the republic of Mazzini and the defence of the city by Garibaldi. The writer claims the number of activists was limited to ‘a few bawlers and brawlers’ a point reinforced in Source B, to some extent, in suggesting revolutionaries preferred to discuss rather than act. Candidates may discuss the reliability of a writer who witnessed events at first hand and who expressed her views in a letter to a friend. In evaluation of the interpretation, candidates might argue that government repression was the main reason for the failure of the revolutionaries though others may place emphasis on the weaknesses of different revolutionary groups and individuals as emphasised in the majority of the sources. Sources on both sides of the argument have limitations in terms of their reliability and use.</p>		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Candidates may simply consider the case for repression and set it against other factors for failure. Some may also consider the argument that can be made against repression being effective. Grouping is open and examiners need to bear this in mind.• Supported overall judgement should be reached on how far the sources support the interpretation. No specific judgement is expected.		

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
3	a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context is that the Missouri Compromise of 1820 confined slavery to the area south of latitude 36 degrees 30 minutes. However, the annexation of Texas in 1845 rekindled the debate about the geographical limit of slavery. • Similarities. Source B states its opposition to the Wilmot Proviso, which stated that slavery should be excluded from any land gained from Mexico, about which these delegates felt strongly describing it as 'degrading to this country'. However, the authors of Source C declare that slavery cannot be extended 'into the Territories where it does not exist'. Nonetheless, both accept the Missouri Compromise of 1820. In Source B, the sentence, 'We are ready to adopt the line of 36 deg. 30 min.' makes this clear and this is made explicit in Source C as the Missouri Compromise is regarded as 'the most important of measures limiting slavery' which is considered to be at risk by the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. • Differences. The sources contrast on how they feel the differences between the sections could be resolved. Source B looks for a peaceful solution. It proposes that 'the Territories should be divided between the sections ... so that the rights of both sections be secured'. Implicit in this is that California be a free territory and New Mexico a slave territory. It also places its faith in Congress to find a solution. Nonetheless, the first resolution indicates that the Convention were selective in their support of federal law for it states 'the slaveholding States will not submit to any law imposing restraints ... on masters moving their 'property' (slaves) into the Territories'. However, by contrast, 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus must be comparative. Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. • No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' (A02) • The comparison must be for the key Issue – as evidence for attitudes to slavery in the Territories. If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded. • The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer. • Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation. • Provenance may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or 'stock'. • Stand-alone knowledge is not rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use context to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse. • Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and below for A02.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Source C is less accommodating, even more belligerent. To some extent Source C supports Source B in looking for a political solution with the pledge to resist 'by speech and vote'. Yet, it goes further by appealing to the public, urging that 'all protest, by whatever means may be expedient'. It also implies a reluctance to accept anything less than they want declaring, 'we shall not submit'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provenance. The sectional stance of the sources is crucial to understanding the difference between the sources. Given the authorship of the sources it is unsurprising that Source B is concerned to safeguard the interests of the South or that the priority of Source C is the defence of Northern interests. However, Source B was the work of representatives of only nine slave States. Six other States were not represented and these were more extreme in their views. In that respect Source B is typical of the attitude of only some Southerners, as these representatives were 'of moderate views'. Similarly, Source C expresses the views of only six men who were 'the most prominent abolitionists in the country' and as such they were not representative of opinion in the North where abolitionist sentiment was patchy. Some candidates may be aware that one of the six men was Charles Sumner who was so outspoken and uncompromising that he was attacked by Preston Brooks, a Southerner, in the Senate in 1856, but this is not to be expected. In these respects it might be considered that neither source was entirely representative of sectional attitudes. The context is key to the evaluation. Both were written prior to the passage of the legislation referred to in the introductions and were intended to sway opinion to 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgements, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. Judgement on the topic rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone. • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>their point of view. At the time of the Nashville Convention the debate on New Mexico and California was deadlocked and a meeting was intended as a means of trying to find a way through the impasse. This helps explain the moderate nature of the resolutions. The meeting of the Independent Democrats followed the publication of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill and the appeal was a direct response to its terms which Northerners regarded as anathema. The appeal was, therefore, a reaction to terms they wished to reverse. In addition, the difference is largely explained by the fact that the Territories in question were different. Given the size and geographical location of New Mexico and California it was easier for those at Nashville to be conciliatory by recommending the division of these Territories and to respect the 36 deg. 30 min. line. California was too far west to be of particular interest and the bulk of New Mexico lay south of the line so the Convention had little to lose by their offer. However, when the Independent Democrats made their appeal, the Territories in question were all north of the line and as such the Kansas-Nebraska Bill was a direct challenge to the Missouri Compromise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In judgement, candidates may argue that Northern and Southern attitudes divided according to sectional interests and that the apparently moderate stance of the Nashville Convention in 1850 was misleading in so far as it only offered concessions because the South stood to gain more than lose by so doing. Indeed, this was confirmed by the uncompromising support of the South for the Kansas-Nebraska Bill in 1854 which was as intransigent as the hostile attitude of the North to 		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>this Bill expressed in Source C.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates may not be familiar with the Nashville Convention or the Appeal but the issues with which they were associated are likely to be well known • A supported judgement should be reached on the relative value of the sources as evidence based on the content and provenance of the sources. No set conclusion is expected and candidates may judge both equally valid. 		
3	<p>b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates will vary in how they interpret some sources. Most will regard Sources C and E as the two most supportive of the interpretation though elements of Sources A and B may be considered too. In challenging the interpretation most are likely to use Sources A and D but also Source B. • Sources C and E accuse the slave interest of conspiracy and from the mid-1840s at least. Source C refers to ‘an atrocious plot’ and Source E claims ‘The Slave Power was dedicated to making slavery the predominating national interest’, which was ‘evident from the time of the Texas plot’. Both sources see the Kansas-Nebraska crisis as central to this conspiracy. In Source C, the signatories to the appeal ‘condemn this bill’ and Source E describes ‘The repeal of the Missouri Compromise’ as ‘a deliberate and direct assault upon freedom’. Both convey a sense of orchestration on behalf of the slavery lobby to impose slavery on the Territories which they see as a threat. Each claims its main concern is the defence of ‘freedom’ which slave society threatens. In Source C the society of ‘masters and slaves’ is described as a ‘tyranny’ with ‘the dearest interests of freedom and the Union are in imminent peril’. 	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question is to assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge a given interpretation. The focus must be on the sources, a use of their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate’s ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below. • A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise. • Bolt-on knowledge is not to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Source E is more expansive on this point in referring to the subsequent Dred Scott decision and the Lecompton Constitution as evidence of the ‘real character’ of those who support slavery in their claim to be more concerned with ‘the popular will’ rather than slavery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates may highlight the limitations of the evidence in Sources C and E. Both were produced by individuals who were vehemently opposed to slavery. After all, the six signatories to Source C were ‘the most prominent abolitionists in the country’ and their hostility to slavery is clear in the language they use: the bill is described as ‘atrocious’ and an ‘enormous crime’. Wilson was a ‘radical Republican’ with years of experience by the time of writing to have shaped a view on the previous decades, and influenced to a large degree, no doubt, by the outcome of the Civil War. It might be argued that opponents of the extension of slavery were, themselves, a little disingenuous in making their case in so far as many opposed the extension of slavery on racial rather than humanitarian or even economic grounds. Candidates can apply the knowledge they have of Southern society and events in Kansas following the Act of 1854 and the Dred Scott case to verify the charges made by Sources C and E. The story of elections and constitutions in Kansas is involved and complicated but goes a long way to explain why those who favoured slavery in Kansas are accused of ‘shameless duplicity’. Candidates might be credited for an appreciation of the manipulation and undemocratic methods of the slavery lobby in the years 1854 to 1858, in Kansas, or a general understanding of the complexity of events. In doing 		<p>knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is unbalanced. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It follows that knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01. • Evaluation of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below. • Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below. • To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the sources need to be grouped according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. Check that a grouping makes sense – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made. • A judgement based on the sources is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing or on the topic rather than the sources. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered. • Be impressed by cross reference within and

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>so candidates may reasonably conclude that the evidence suggests that the notion of a ‘conspiracy’ is understandable and why Wilson uses the word ‘engineered’ to describe what he considers to have been an ‘astounding fraud’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources A and B might be cited by some candidates in support of the interpretation. In Source A, Stephens, in the opening sentence, implies that others (‘some gentlemen’), at least, regarded his motives as consistent with the extension of slavery even if he denied it. Source A’s claim that he was interested in the annexation of Texas for political reasons, is plausible. However, this might be regarded as camouflage for other aims, notably the supremacy of the slave interest in so far as a numerical superiority in the Senate would make it easier for the slave lobby to promote its interests thereafter. Given the key role Stephens played in triggering the secession crisis in 1860 and as a leader of the Confederate States during the war, candidates might argue that the evidence in Source A is not entirely convincing. However, this was said 15 years before the crisis of 1860 and it could equally be asserted that at the time of writing Stephens was being honest. • Similarly, in Source B, the first resolution indicates a refusal to accept any ‘restraints upon the rights of masters to move their property into the Territories’. In addition, the rejection of the Wilmot Proviso may be regarded as a statement of intent to extend slavery into the Territories in question. The fact that the Convention drew nine slave States together might be interpreted as proof of a conspiracy. • In support of the counter-argument, Source A categorically denies any interest in extending 		<p>between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but do not apply inflexibly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the sources to illustrate an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is referencing. • It is not necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement. • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded – do not mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>slavery claiming ‘I am no defender of slavery in the abstract’ and refuting any suggestion his support for slavery in Texas is to extend slavery on the grounds that ‘slavery already exists in Texas’. (Indeed, Americans had been settling in Texas, with their slaves, since the 1820s though the numbers were small. After gaining independence from Mexico in 1836 there had been some clamour to become a part of the US and in 1844 the debate reached a climax during the Presidential election with Polk, the victor, in support of annexation which followed in 1845. This gave the slave States the edge over non-slave States in the Union.) Also, there is no indication that Source A represents the views of anyone other than Stephens and his constituency. The second resolution in Source B indicates a willingness to compromise, in the spirit of the contemporary debate, and, at least, if there was a conspiracy, that it was of limited ambition. The delegates show no desire to take slavery into all the territory taken from Mexico or to breach the Missouri Compromise. It might be argued that this was simply an acceptance of the impracticability of doing so. So, in both cases it might be argued that the evidence does not confirm a ‘conspiracy’ so much as a position or attitude of Southerners on the issue of slavery. In the case of Texas, Northerners as well as Southerners agreed a joint resolution of Congress to allow Texas to join the Union. If Source B is considered as evidence of a conspiracy of Southerners it was not well organised given that six slave States did not attend the Nashville Convention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those at the Convention may have trimmed their demands in part because of the doctrine of ‘popular 		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>sovereignty' that Douglas proposed during the debate of 1850 and which he explains in Source D. He considered it the responsibility of the people of a Territory to decide on the issue of slavery claiming 'it will go where people want it'. Behind the notion of 'popular sovereignty' lies the conviction that democracy was the best means of resolving the matter as demonstrated in Kansas. This was true in so far as, eventually, in August 1858, elections in Kansas resulted in a majority for Kansas to be 'free' (so Douglas was anticipating the outcome at the time of this speech) and it joined the Union in January 1861 as a 'free State'. However, Douglas ignores the fact that between 1854 and 1858 those in favour of slavery organised a campaign of political violence and intimidation, as Source E implies, that might be regarded as a conspiracy. Similarly, he glosses over Lincoln's alarm about the Dred Scott decision ignoring the concerns of many that the Supreme Court was party to such a conspiracy and that it presaged the extension of slavery into the Territories. It is clear that Douglas is not deaf to the claims of conspiracy given the last line of the source. However, he considers 'this slavery agitation' to be fabricated by Republicans for political reasons to 'use it as their means to gain office' rather than by those who favoured slavery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In judgement, candidates will divide in their evaluation of the interpretation. Many may agree with Douglas that the idea of a 'conspiracy' was a device of politicians who thought they would benefit from fanning the issue. After all, Sources C and E, which provide most of the evidence for a conspiracy, were written by abolitionists and a 		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>radical Republican. On the other hand the firm attitudes of those who favoured slavery, shown in Sources A and B, as well as the lengths they were prepared to go in Kansas, apparently backed by President Buchanan, might be the basis of a conclusion that supports the interpretation. The reliability and utility of the sources will determine their relative value. Candidates may assess the evidence in different ways. Some will be aware of the ambivalence of some sources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although no specific judgement is expected it should be supported by clear evaluation of the sources. 		

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
4	a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context is that the Nazi state was hostile to Christianity but unwilling to engage in open conflict, notably with the Roman Catholic Church which might lead to direct action from the Pope. The Nazis hoped that religion would gradually cease to be important in the state and be replaced with the near worship of Hitler. Women could continue to believe as church was seen as one of their areas of activity, but children were targeted as Nazi Youth Movements drew them away from Christian groups. • Similarities are that they agree Christianity was under attack with the crucifix being taken down in Source B and the reference to fighting in Source C. Both also show that the Churches were resisting. The crucifix was put back in Source B. The commissioning of the report in C indicates the Churches were acting and it says that church-going was holding up, despite the other problems. • Differences relate to the degree of support the Churches enjoyed. In Source B, village opinion favours the reinstatement of the crucifix and the witness is a lone voice arguing for the government position. But Source C suggests that people felt powerless and that there was little they could do to remedy the situation as the state insidiously insinuated itself into youth movements and schools. In Source B the state reaction came very rapidly, within 3 days, but in Source C it is a more gradual process • Provenance indicates different viewpoints. Both are official sources but Source B comes from the government, while Source C is from the Protestant 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus must be comparative. Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. • No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' (A02) • The comparison must be for the key Issue – as evidence for the Churches under the Nazis. If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded. • The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer. • Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation. • Provenance may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or 'stock'. • Stand-alone knowledge is not rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use context to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse. • Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Church. Both are based on observation, but B concerns one relatively minor incident, while Source C is based on enquiries made throughout one province. C seems likely to be more typical. Source B could be an isolated incident or it could reflect a common feeling and be reported to act as a deterrent to others. But, even so, only the most active of the protesting group, the man who acted in fetching the ladder and doing the deed, was punished.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgement - both are equally valid in the points they make. But the broader sweep of Source C makes it more useful. Its aim was to collect information and perhaps even to use it to make representations to the government. B is too limited in its range both in the numbers involved and its geographical restriction to one locality. 		<p>below for A02.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgements, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. Judgement on the topic rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone. • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance.
4	b	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question is to assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge a given interpretation. The focus must be on the sources, a use of their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate's ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below. • A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. Remember that there

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>much wider scale, with the State pursuing a non-Christian programme, even apparently in contravention of its own Penal Code. Sources B and C come from a time when the Nazi State was becoming fully operational and so illustrate its aim accurately. Sources D and E come from the war time period, when moral standards could be seen to be slipping. Bormann may have felt that in a time of crisis the perceived weakness of Christianity was a considerable drag on the Nazi State and so was even more antagonistic towards it. There is every reason to suppose that he reflected the views of Hitler.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The view that the Nazi State could accommodate Christianity, is found most obviously in Source A, with some inferences in Source D and some mention in Sources B and C. Source A explicitly states that the State and the Roman Catholic Church could work in tandem, each sticking to its own sphere. In Source D the Christian ethic is strongly stated with reference to the moral laws of God. The Source does not exactly suggest co-operation with the State as it is violently opposed to euthanasia. But the abandonment of parts of the programme as a result of von Galen's actions could be seen to do so. The villagers' actions in B suggests that they, at least, thought it was possible for the two to co-exist. They hung the crucifix next to Hitler's portrait. But this may have been because they dared not be so openly defiant as to remove the portrait, especially with the local informer on hand to witness what was going on. Source C shows similar difficulties with the slow decline of religious practice in southern Germany. There was accommodation with the 		<p>are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bolt-on knowledge is not to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is unbalanced. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance). • It follows that knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01. • Evaluation of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below. • Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below. • To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the sources need to be grouped according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. Check that a grouping makes sense – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made. • A judgement based on the sources is required for

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>state for the time being but it seemed to many that the position of Christianity was being systematically eroded. But it was difficult to find a definite point on which to take a stand. The protestors in Source B had found an issue, but it was hardly a major show-down with the State and the tone suggests there may have been ill-feeling between groups in the village. Behind all these Sources apart from D is the implied fear of what the Nazi State could do. The bishops in A were all too ready to co-operate, especially as they wanted Nazi support against their great enemy, Bolshevism. But their obsequiousness robs the final, more challenging, sentence of much likelihood of being heeded. Such proponents would not worry Bormann. In B the State acted against an opponent in a trivial matter. But this could easily escalate and shows the potential threat. The events outlined in C showed that the appeal of the Nazi Youth Movements and the new curriculum in schools were hard to resist. Membership of the HJ had become compulsory and agreements made with the Church not to poach its young people had been disregarded. Teachers had to be committed Nazis. This was not accommodation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the Sources show instances of Christians trying to maintain their position, apart from D they were not very successful. Arguably von Galen's aristocratic background and his immense popularity and public support explained why no action was taken against him and he got results. He was in general, conservative in his views, but outraged by euthanasia. Knowledge could provide other examples of Christian opposition from the Confessional Church, Niemoller and Bonhoeffer. 		<p>Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing or on the topic rather than the sources. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be impressed by cross reference within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but do not apply inflexibly. If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the sources to illustrate an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is referencing. It is not necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement. Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded – do not mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>The ambivalent position of the Papacy, keen to salvage what it could, also allowed the Nazi State to proceed against Christianity. The exigencies of the war meant that Christians were no longer seen as quite such a priority for being targeted by the Nazi State. The answer could be that Christianity and Nazism were incompatible in theory as Bormann makes abundantly clear, but that in the end, either Christianity was too ingrained as Source B might indicate, or the Nazis had other more important and vital concerns and so Christianity and Nazism co-existed uneasily, which all the Sources apart from E support in varying degrees. E could be explained as the work of a fanatical Nazi, imbued with Nazi beliefs, and not necessarily a key policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates can use the Sources flexibly as most of them offer opportunities to be used for both sides of the argument. • Although no specific judgement is expected it should be supported by clear evaluation of the sources. 		

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
5	a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Sources have some similarities. Source A refers to Diem's loss of his previous 'energizing role' and both sources refer to Diem's family as a difficulty. Source A point out that Nhu manipulates power and is beyond control and Source B that no member of his family can gain the support needed to govern effectively. Knowledge might be used to confirm that the strong characters of Nhu and his wife dominated Diem's government. The Sources also agree that Diem has little support but they differ on the classes who did not accept his government. Source A says that Diem lacks support from ordinary people outside the cities, and that the Vietcong are largely in control in large areas of the countryside. Source B agrees with this by mentioning the substantial risk of Diem losing Vietnam. The provenance of the sources might be compared at this point – both authors have brief, personal experience of the situation in South Vietnam. Mansfield has just returned from a fact-finding mission and Cabot Lodge is residing in Saigon after his recent appointment as ambassador. It might be suggested that Mansfield may have been given more information about the countryside than Cabot Lodge, whose experience may be limited to the city. There might be some evaluation of the reliability of their Vietnamese sources – in both cases there has almost certainly been contact with Vietnamese ARVN generals, who worked closely with US military advisers, hence Cabot Lodge's involvement in overthrowing Diem. Source B differs from Source A, in that it identifies the Vietnamese educated class, influential in government and society, as having been recently alienated by Diem's government. This might be because among 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focus must be comparative. Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below. Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' (A02) The comparison must be for the key Issue – as evidence for the difficulties faced by the Diem government in South Vietnam. If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded. The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation. Provenance may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or 'stock'. Stand-alone knowledge is not rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use context to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse. Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>these groups are Cabot Lodge's other main contacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge might be used to confirm incidents involving Nhu and his wife, such as the Buddhist crisis and Madame Nhu's reaction to the self-immolation of Thích Quảng Duc. • Source A suggests Diem's difficulties are compounded by his government's ineffective use of American financial help, because of government corruption. It might be inferred that Source B's suggestion that the American people had been alienated refers to Diem's misuse of US taxes. There is a strong hint in Source A of unwillingness to continue to see US money drain away in South Vietnam. However, while in Source A US support for Diem is seen as the only option, neo-colonial rule or full scale war are unthinkable, in Source B Diem, unknown to him, has lost US support. Kennedy's administration has embarked on a course to overthrow his government. • When comparing provenance, it might be regarded as typical that the spokesman for the Democrats in the Senate would emphasize the financial difficulties of Diem and urge against full scale war, in the light of Republican pro-war attitudes, whereas Cabot Lodge's more aggressive stance is less typical. The tone of Source A is much firmer and emphatic than that of Source B, which is justifying the new course of action to overthrow Diem, so may be exaggerating Diem's loss of support from the educated Vietnamese knowing that Dean Rusk is opposed to an interventionist policy. • In terms of a judgement, both sources are valid in terms of the Diem government but Source B is written at a later date when Diem's position has deteriorated and so may be seen as the more useful source. 		<p>below for A02.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgements, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. Judgement on the topic rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone. • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
5 b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources A and to an extent C are useful in support of the interpretation in the question, while Sources B, D, E and to an extent C are useful for the counter-argument. Sources A, and part of C are useful in support of the interpretation in the question that the USA wished to distance itself from the problems of South Vietnam. Source A, as a report prepared for the President, states clearly that ‘the primary responsibility rests with the Vietnamese’, suggesting that Diem has to solve his problems without increased US involvement. He thus recommends that the USA should keep its distance. • Knowledge of Diem’s tyrannical regime might also be used to evaluate the report in Source A which criticises Diem’s regime for ‘danger of unbridled power’ and ‘rumours of corruption’ especially by Ngo Dinh Nhu and Madame Nhu, from which the US wished to distance itself. Source A ‘emphatically’ argues against the USA embarking on ‘a full scale war against the guerillas’, i.e. the Viet Cong, in South Vietnam or a neo-colonial policy there. The implication is that US funds should be phased down, as ‘billions of US dollars’ had been wasted and the problems were getting worse. • Knowledge of the limited nature of US financial and military aid to Diem might be used in evaluation. Source C is a secret document where Kennedy might be seen to be distancing the US by shirking any public responsibility for the coup - he wishes to give it ‘no active encouragement’. However, it might be suggested that loss of American support for Diem, mentioned in Source B, might have softened the impact of his decision to ‘turn a blind eye’ to a coup and that he knew this, explaining his ambivalence. • In contrast, Sources B, D and E and to an extent C, 	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question is to assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge a given interpretation. The focus must be on the sources, a use of their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate’s ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below. • A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise. • Bolt-on knowledge is not to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is unbalanced. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance). • It follows that knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01. • Evaluation of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>support the counter-argument that the USA wished to continue its involvement in the problems of South Vietnam. Source A reveals that the USA had contributed billions of dollars of aid and military personnel to advise the South Vietnamese government. In Source C Kennedy's secret opinion, that a coup must be 'totally secure and fully deniable', but that the US would 'not hinder a change of government or deny economic and military assistance to a new regime' shows the active acceptance of regime change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provenance of Source C makes it useful as evidence for the Kennedy administration's ambiguous views on active involvement, as it is a top secret telegram with a sense of urgency, sent a few weeks before the successful coup. • Knowledge might be used to show the use of Source C for counter-argument. e.g. Lodge made 'secret contacts' with the coup leaders who successfully overthrew Diem on 2 November 1963 and took no action to stop the assassinations of Diem and Nhu. In Source D, the VWP assess the situation after the overthrow and death of Diem to suggest imminent US intervention and troop escalation to a more aggressive stance by the USA. D reveals Hanoi's views that the USA had never had any desire to distance itself from South Vietnam's problems. Instead they had used Diem for their own aims 'to repress the national liberation movement'; 'to establish their neo-colonialist policy'; 'to build up military bases to attack North Vietnam' and 'to stop communism spreading throughout Southeast Asia'. • Knowledge might be used to evaluate these claims, e.g. domino theory, but the views in Source D are likely to be seen as unreliable and highly subjective in 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below. • To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the sources need to be grouped according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. Check that a grouping makes sense – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made. • A judgement based on the sources is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing or on the topic rather than the sources. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered. • Be impressed by cross reference within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but do not apply inflexibly. • If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the sources to illustrate an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is referencing. • It is not necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>the light of the two sides' ideological differences and the Cold War context. Source D has an urgent tone, as its purpose is to take advantage of the instability of the new South Vietnamese regime and seize the opportunity for a quick victory. This sense of crisis is intensified in Source E where Johnson, having assumed the Presidency after Kennedy's assassination is in the throes of a presidential campaign. He changes policy to effectively assume war powers under the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution enabling the USA to enter a 'full scale war'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the situation in August 1964 might be used to evaluate the reliability of Source E's content. The claim of Hanoi's naval aggression against US vessels was fabricated to give Johnson an excuse to intervene, establishing air bases and stationing US forces in South Vietnam for a full scale war to end Northern support for the Viet Cong. Johnson in Source E ignores Democrat advice in 1962 in Source A, 'most emphatically' recommending against 'full scale war or neocolonial rule' and the USA enters an interventionist period. Sources C and E are not to be taken at face value in light of events, but their secrecy and purpose enhance their utility in revealing US views on intervention and the problems of Vietnam. • It might be judged that the USA was in fact intervening rather than distancing itself while attempting to cover up its actions. Although no specific judgement is expected it should be supported by clear evaluation of the sources. • Although no specific judgement is expected it should be supported by clear evaluation of the sources. 		<p>impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded – do not mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point.

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 2015

