

Section 3: Primary sources

3.1 Finding primary sources

So far you have decided on a title, begun to unpack the question in terms of establishing how your topic could be interpreted (see page 20) and you are now going to research primary evidence. This is a requirement and there are 10 marks out of 40 for the use and evaluation of a range of primary sources. First of all you do have to make sure that it is possible to find a range of primary sources. However interesting your question, if you can't actually access primary evidence, then you won't be able to meet the requirements of the OCR mark scheme.

Let's say that you have chosen a medieval topic and the following question:

How far was the outcome of the Battle of Hastings a result of the leadership of William of Normandy?

There is an obvious discussion here. Initial reading has led you to a series of possible explanations:

- the leadership of William
- mistakes by Harold
- the exhaustion of the Saxon forces
- the nature of the tactics used by both sides.

You will be looking for primary evidence to support different explanations that you can use in two ways:

- 1 Primary evidence could support or contradict the views of different historians about the reasons for the Norman victory.
- 2 Primary material in itself might present evidence for an explanation.

It might be that within your school or college's History department there are primary sources about the battle or collections of sources or extracts from original sources in secondary books. It might be that the department library or the whole school library have relevant sources. However, it might be that this is a topic that has caught your interest and imagination and does not feature in your school's advanced level studies. In this case, you are on your own and need to be an independent researcher.

A good starting point would be an internet search such as 'Battle of Hastings primary sources'. The screenshot below is just an example; websites often go out of use and of course any material from websites must be acknowledged in footnotes and in a bibliography.

Battle of Hastings 1066 - Spartacus Educational
spartacus-educational.com › Medieval Britain › The Normans
Main Article Primary Sources (1) Message sent by William of Normandy just before the Battle of Hastings took place (quoted by William of Poitiers in Deeds of the ...

The Battle of Hastings: Sources and Interpretations ...
books.google.co.uk › History › Military › General
5/5 · 2 reviews
The Battle of Hastings is a unique collection of materials focused on one of the most significant battles in European history. It includes all the primary sources for ...

BBC - Primary History - Anglo-Saxons - The Normans
www.bbc.co.uk/schools/primaryhistory/.../teachers_resources.shtml
BBC Primary History - Anglo-Saxons - The Normans - Teachers' resources...
Battle of Hastings and the Bayeux Tapestry; Hands on History: ...

The Battle of Hastings Primary Resources, Normans - Page 1
www.twinkl.co.uk/resources/topics/history/the-battle-of-hastings
Download and use, high quality printable The Battle of Hastings teaching resources - created for teachers, by teachers! Professional History teaching resources for ...

(*The Battle of Hastings: Sources and Interpretations ...
www.academia.edu/449328/The_Battle_of_Hastings_Sources_and...
The Battle of Hastings: Sources and Interpretations... The primary sources for the battle are limited ... a close look at Hastings, where the sources are obviously, ..

Having carried out an internet search, you are now sure that there won't be any problem in finding sources. In fact, there may be a problem of knowing where to start and at what level. A study of the battle would be useful as this may explain what evidence is available. Stephen Morillo's study, *The Battle of Hastings: Sources and Interpretations* (Warfare in History) gives a list of the following sources and he has posted his introduction on the website above(*):

- The Bayeux tapestry
- The Anglo Saxon Chronicle
- Florence of Worcester
- William of Jumièges
- The Gesta (Deeds) of William of Poitiers
- The site of the battlefield itself.

For issues on the dangers of using the internet for research see page 67.

Understanding online sources

A

Look at the websites in the screenshot on page 24. Identify those that are aimed:

- at Years 7–9
- to give resources for primary schools
- to give information about a book
- to provide resources for teachers
- to offer academic material.

Consider the following questions:

Which site would you visit first, and why?

Why is the list of sources about the battle useful and how would you go about finding more about the evidence from the list above?

What do you need to know about each of the sources?

If you don't live near Hastings, should you discount the actual site as evidence? Could you look at a virtual tour? What use would a site visit be?

My progress

Having completed the activity above, now is your chance to map out your own work on finding primary sources.

My provisional title

The results of my initial research into sources

Are there enough sources accessible for me to continue with this title?

My next step is

3.2 Using sources

By this stage you will have identified key arguments and viewpoints and have made sure that there are primary sources that can be accessed. You should be researching the evidence but you must also be sure of what it is telling you in relation to your question and how it might be used.

For example, you might be researching 'How successfully did Nazi policies towards women achieve their aims?' Your initial reading and research have established that there could be a discussion possible here, depending on the aims. A search on the internet has revealed accessible sources and a survey of the books and articles available has shown that there is evidence that can be accessed. For example, Matthew Stibbe, *Women in the Third Reich* (Arnold 2003); Jill Stephenson, *Women in Nazi Germany* (Routledge 2001) and Noakes and Pridham, *Nazism Vol 2* (University of Exeter Press document collection).

By breaking down the question you have made research a lot easier. So let's say that the focus of this week's research is Nazi aims for women in society. First of all you need to establish what the aims were.

The initial research, then, might look for evidence from the time about these aims to establish it clearly. Then you can think about the next stage which is to assess how far they were successfully met. There are collections of original sources in book form and also internet resources.

For example:

Source A: Gertrude Scholtz Klink, writing in 1936

Women, I wish to try briefly to make clear what the deepest calling we women have is: motherhood. In the bad fourteen years between 1918 and 1933, motherhood was often robbed of its deepest meaning and reduced to something superficial, something that was even held in contempt. Instead of a child being seen as the deepest affirmation of the woman and of life, it was seen as a burden, as a sacrifice on the part of the woman.

Source B: The published collection of sources in *Nazism* by Noakes and Pridham (*Nazism 1919–1945 Volume 2: State, Economy and Society 1933–39*) gives this view by Hitler in a speech in 1934

The woman's is a smaller world. For her the world is her husband, her family, her children and her home ... The greater world is built on the foundation of this smaller world.

Source C: Goebbels speaks on German women at a speech opening an exhibition on motherhood

We do not see the woman as inferior, but rather as having a different mission ... The woman has always been not only the man's sexual companion, but also his fellow worker. Long ago, she did heavy labor with the man in the field. She moved with him into the cities, entering the offices and factories ... The woman in public life today is no different than the women of the past. No one who understands the modern age would have the crazy idea of driving women from public life, from work, profession, and bread winning. But it must also be said that those things that belong to the man must remain his. That includes politics and the military ... At the risk of sounding reactionary and outdated, let me say this clearly: The first, best, and most suitable place for the woman is in the family, and her most glorious duty is to give children to her people and nation, children who can continue the line of generations and who guarantee the immortality of the nation ... The national revolutionary government is everything but reactionary. It wants to be the pathfinder of the future ... The government is determined to halt this decline of the family and the resulting impoverishment of our blood ... Women are the foundation of our race, of its blood, and of its future.

These sources are all from leading figures in the party and first of all there should be a clear understanding of what they are saying in relation to the **aims** of the movement. This has to be extracted from the sources as the evidence does not state the aims directly.

Understanding the evidence

A

Look at the three sources on page 26 and complete the table below. Think about what aim is implied in each source and pick out some key extracts to illustrate this.

Source	Aims	Key phrases
A		
B		
C		

Now use the sources to test the following view about women:

'Nazi policies had the aim of turning the clock back to a period before Weimar emancipation and were reactionary, looking backwards rather than accepting the modern world of working and independent women. Social control of women was at the heart of their aims.'

My progress

Choose any three of the sources you have identified for one of your key arguments. Explain what they say about the issue.

Issue

Source	What it says about the issue	A key phrase or sentence to illustrate this
1		
2		
3		

3.3 Using sources to test a view

On page 27 you were asked to use the sources to test a view. This is going to be an important aspect of your coursework. AO3 requires you to assess secondary evidence and an effective way to do this is to deploy primary sources. What you may also do is use primary evidence to assess a view given by other evidence.

Let's take the example of how far the US Civil War (1861–65) was brought about by the issue of slavery. There is a good debate about this. The Southern states of the USA decided to leave the United States and set up their own separate country – the Confederate States of America – after the election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860. Lincoln was known to be personally opposed to slavery and no Southern state had voted for him. But was the issue one of slavery? Was it more an issue about keeping the USA unified by preventing the South breaking away? Were there other grievances such as economic issues and had the rural South a different lifestyle and culture from the industrial North? Did most people in the North really care about African slaves? Most people in the South certainly did not own slaves. The following sources could support a view that slavery was the key.

Source A: The slave-owning state of South Carolina declared its break away from the USA like this in 1861.

A geographical line has been drawn across the Union, and all the States north of that line have united in the election of a man (Lincoln) to the high office of President of the United States, whose opinions are hostile to slavery.

On the 4th day of March next, the anti-slavery party will take possession of the Government. It has announced that a war must be waged against slavery until it shall cease throughout the United States. The guarantees of the Constitution will then no longer exist; the equal rights of the States will be lost. The slaveholding States will no longer have the power of self-government, or self-protection, and the Federal Government will have become their enemy.

Source B: In 1860 the manifesto of Lincoln's Republican party made it clear that they opposed the extension of slavery to any new lands made into territories as the USA expanded westwards.

That the normal condition of all the territory of the United States is that of freedom; and we deny the authority of Congress, of a territorial legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to Slavery in any Territory of the United States.

Source C: Abraham Lincoln speech (1860).

A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved; I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South.

Slavery and the US Civil War

The USA was divided by the issue of slavery after it gained independence from Britain. The Northern states ended the practice of having African slaves but the South, because of the great expansion of cotton growing, increased the use of slaves. The North saw industrial expansion in the first part of the nineteenth century. It also saw movements against slavery on moral grounds. The South became defensive about its right to own slaves and also to take them west into the new lands that were being opened up. The issue was not just the morality of slavery but the rights of each state to run its own affairs. There were other issues such as economic policy and import duties. Also the needs of commerce and industry in the North were different from those of the more agricultural South. A new political party emerged in the 1850s called the Republicans. They were opposed to the expansion of slavery and contained many who thought that it should eventually be ended. Their candidate, Abraham Lincoln, won the presidential election of 1860. No Southern states voted for him, so the USA became divided.

Then a crisis came about and some Southern states broke away from the USA. This led to the outbreak of hostilities in April 1861 and a long and costly war between the Union (the North) and the Confederacy (the South).

Using sources to test a view

A

The sources on page 28 are quite long and the collection that contains them has them in substantial length and not just short extracts – though secondary sources often use shorter quotations, like Lincoln’s ‘a house divided against itself cannot stand’. They could be used to support a view from a historian saying that ‘Slavery was the overwhelming issue that took the United States into civil war in 1861’.

It would help if the sources were linked and relevant parts compared. For example, what content from the other sources might support the following sentence?

‘The South left the Union and thus started the process that led to war because they rightly thought that Lincoln and his party were, as the South Carolina declaration of breakaway said, ‘hostile to slavery’ and that the new ‘federal Government will ... become their enemy’. This seemed to be justified by Lincoln’s speech in 1860 (use Source C) ...

It was also apparent in the manifesto of the Republicans in 1860 (use Source B) ...

Now this isn’t the end of the story. All these sources are primary and cannot be taken at face value and there is an alternative view that the Union, rather than slavery as such, was the key issue. But we are focusing on building blocks here.

My progress

In your chosen topic find a key argument (for example, that economic factors can be seen as key to Mussolini’s rise to power or that the Pilgrimage of Grace was caused by purely religious factors) and use evidence to support that view.

Key argument

Evidence to support that view

3.4 Evaluation of primary sources using provenance

The use of primary material to support or contradict a view of a historian is important for gaining marks for AO3, but it is also important to evaluate primary sources. You will have been doing this in the British period study and enquiry (Unit 1) part of your A-level History course and the principle remains the same.

Provenance

Primary evidence has to be related to provenance. This requires considering who produced the evidence and why it was produced. The nature of the evidence has to be considered, that is, what the source is. Is it a speech, for instance? If so, to whom was it delivered, when and for what purpose? Is it a letter? If so, to whom was it written, when and why? The nature of the source, its origin and its purpose all have to be considered before you can decide whether it can be used to validate or challenge an argument. This is nothing new and you probably have been doing this since at least Year 7 and probably earlier in history lessons.

Contextual knowledge

The other element in source evaluation is to consider what knowledge you have that might support or challenge a view or another piece of evidence. You will be doing this in the Thematic Study and Historical Interpretations (Unit 3) part of the course to test interpretations and you will be expected to do this in Unit 1 in the source question.

In this context, the evaluation of evidence needs to be integrated into the essay. This will be considered later, but here we deal with using provenance to test primary evidence.

Let's take the example of the Vietnam War. After a long struggle against Communist forces, the USA left Vietnam in 1975 and suffered its first major defeat in the period after the Second World War. One contributory factor was hostile media and press coverage and the US home front, but how important was this? The three sources below offer different viewpoints.

Source A: In 1995 a senior Vietnamese commander, Bui Tin, gave an interview to the *Wall Street Journal*.

The anti-war movement was essential to our strategy. Support of the war from our rear was completely secure while the American rear was vulnerable. Every day our leadership would listen to world news over the radio at 9 a.m. to follow the growth of the American antiwar movement. Visits to Hanoi by people like Jane Fonda, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark and ministers gave us confidence that we should hold on in the face of battlefield reverses.

Source B: In 1996 the North Vietnamese commanding officer General Giap gave an interview to CNN and was asked what the key to victory was.

The Americans fought the Vietnamese, but they did not know much about Vietnam or anything at all about the Vietnamese people. Vietnam is an old nation founded in a long history before the birth of Christ ... They knew little about our war theories, tactics and patterns of operation ...

We have a philosophy that is different from that of the Americans. The Americans did not understand that. As our president said, there was nothing more precious than independence and freedom. We would rather sacrifice than be slaves.

Source C: The journalist Robert Elegant reported the war and recorded his views in the British magazine *Encounter* in 1981. A British-American author and journalist born in New York City, he spent many years in Asia as a journalist.

For the first time in modern history, the outcome of a war was determined not on the battlefield but on the printed page and, above all, on the television screen. Looking back coolly, I believe it can be said that South Vietnamese and American forces actually won the limited military struggle. They virtually crushed the Viet Cong in the South, and thereafter they threw back the invasion by regular North Vietnamese divisions. Nonetheless, the war was finally lost because the political pressures built up by the media had made it quite impossible for Washington to maintain even the minimal material and moral support that would have enabled the Saigon regime to continue effective resistance.

How can consideration of provenance help to assess this evidence? A

- 1 Look at the origins of the sources on page 30. Were the authors in a position to know?
- 2 Look at why the sources were produced. Does that help assess their credibility or value?
- 3 Look at when they were produced.
- 4 Are there contradictions in the explanations of the importance of the media? How might they be explained by the provenance?
- 5 How convincing do you find the analysis below?

Some journalists blamed the US media for the defeat. Robert Elegant in 1981 claimed that it was the first war that had been determined by the printed page and the television screen. Written by an observer but not someone who was involved in the actual fighting and in the aftermath of the war when there was frustration at the loss, this evidence might be questioned, but it is supported by a Vietnamese commander, Bui Tin. Though he gave an interview in 1995 in an American newspaper he confirms the importance of the coverage given to the US anti-war movement by the media in sustaining the North Vietnamese and in helping them frame a strategy. Both agree that the US home front was of key importance. He claimed 'the anti-war movement was essential to our strategy' and he was closely involved in making decisions. However, this view was not offered by the overall commander Giap in an interview in 1996. He ascribed victory to the efforts of the Vietnamese themselves, inspired by a desire for freedom. Given the huge sacrifices this might be a view that Giap would take, especially twenty years after the events.

- 6 Would contextual knowledge make the evaluation of the chosen evidence more convincing and, if so, what sort of knowledge?
-
-

My progress

In your chosen topic, look back to what you wrote on page 29 and now add something about the provenance of your sources that might help you to decide whether their support can be trusted.

Start by making some comments about the nature, origin and purpose of the sources you used.

3.5 Evaluation of sources using own knowledge

While it is important to look at the provenance of primary sources when using them to support an argument or assess a secondary source, it is also important to use your knowledge of the period and the topic to weigh evidence.

Let's take the following question.

'A great war leader.' Assess this view of Winston Churchill.

One of the points that could be discussed is the bombing of Germany. Would a great war leader condone heavy bombing of German cities that caused millions of deaths for results that have been questioned? Or was Churchill only too aware of the need for restraint and did he have the humanity to see that the campaign should not go too far?

Look at this source.

Source A: Churchill writes to senior RAF commanders in March 1945 expressing concerns about the bombing of Germany. Quoted in Nigel Knight, *Churchill: The Greatest Briton Unmasked*, page 294 (2010)

It seems to me that the moment has come when the question of bombing German cities simply for the sake of increasing the terror though under other pretexts should be reviewed. Otherwise we shall come under control of an utterly ruined land – the destruction of Dresden remains a serious query against the conduct of allied bombing. I feel the need for more concentration upon military objectives rather than more acts of terror and wanton destruction.

This seems to show Churchill as a wise and great leader. He is not afraid to look at the effects of bombing and stand against 'terror and destruction' and focus on military targets and to be critical of policies. As this is not for publication but is a confidential letter to his senior commanders while the war was still going on, then he is not simply appearing to be moderate.

So far the source has been interpreted and its provenance considered. However, is it typical? Earlier in the war he had supported the heavy bombing of Germany and backed the war on German civilians

waged by Bomber Command. This is shown by Source B. Also by 1944 there was some concern about the morality of bombing which he needed to react to. This is shown by Source C. Despite his letter of March 1945 (Source A), Churchill had been willing to wage ruthless war on civilians even using gas. This is shown by Source D. Thus his attitude towards bombing was inconsistent and could be extreme so, put into context, the evidence of the letter for greatness may not be very convincing.

Source B: Churchill writes to the head of Bomber Command, Arthur Harris, on 1 June 1942, after the 1000-strong bomber raid on Cologne. Quoted in James Fyfe, *The Great Ingratitude*, page 241 (1993)

I congratulate you and the whole of Bomber Command upon the remarkable feat of organization which enabled you to despatch over a thousand bombers to Cologne in a single night. The proof of the growing power of the British Bomber force is also the herald of what Germany will receive city by city from now on.

Source C: Bishop George Bell of Chichester speaks in the House of Lords about the bombing (9 February 1944)

Do the Government understand the full force of what area bombardment is doing and is destroying now? Are they alive not only to the vastness of the material damage, much of which is irreparable, but also to the harvest they are laying up for the future relationships of the peoples of Europe as well as to its moral implications? To obliterate a whole town because certain portions contain military and industrial establishments is to reject the balance.

Source D: Churchill discusses bombing and possible gas attacks on the Germans in a memorandum to Chiefs of Staff (6 July 1944)

It is absurd to consider morality on this topic when everybody used gas in the last war with no complaints from the moralists or the Church. I want a cold-blooded calculation of how it would pay us to use poison gas. We could drench the cities of the Ruhr and many other cities in Germany in such a way that most of the population would be requiring medical attention.

Evaluation of evidence

A

Look at these two paragraphs and decide which you think better evaluates the evidence used.

Paragraph 1

Churchill was determined to wage war against Germany very rigorously and was not afraid to take drastic measures. This included bombing campaigns. After the 1000 bomber raid on Cologne in 1942, he wrote to the head of Bomber Command Arthur Harris on 'the remarkable feat' of sending a thousand bombers and told him that it heralded further attacks. Though there were critics, such as Bishop Bell who warned of 'the harvest' for 'future relationships' that bombing was laying up, Churchill was not afraid to take difficult decisions in the interests of the war effort.

Paragraph 2

Churchill was not afraid of difficult decisions and gave his congratulations and backing to Bomber Command for the 'remarkable feat' of organising the 1000 bomber raid on Cologne in 1942, making it clear that it heralded more attacks 'city by city' in a letter sent to Arthur Harris. However, Churchill's views were not consistent and this evidence cannot be seen as typical. His support for the policy wavered after the destruction of Dresden urging in a memorandum in March 1945 to senior commanders that 'the question of bombing German cities ... for the sake of increasing terror ... should be reviewed' as Dresden was 'a serious query against the conduct of allied bombing'. However, it could be argued that the war was much closer to being won by then and that by March 1945 Churchill was rightly concerned with rebuilding Europe after the peace. It could also be argued that the exceptionally heavy casualties in Dresden, which was not really a military target, led rightly to doubts. The lack of consistency does question Churchill's greatness, especially as in July 1944 he was urging the use of poison gas in a memorandum to the Chiefs of Staff 'to drench the cities of the Ruhr'. The limitations of his greatness can also be seen in his overestimation of the effects of bombing, as expressed in his congratulations to Harris. In fact, German war production was not seriously affected by the 1942 raid or many of the raids that followed ...

The paragraph that I think is more evaluative:

Why I think this:

My progress

From research into your own topic, extend the writing you did on page 29 in which you used sources to support/question an argument and introduce some evaluation of one or more of the sources used. Using a table like the one below might be helpful.

Source	Evaluation

3.6 Using the skills you have developed in Unit 1

The enquiry part of Unit 1, both at AS and A-level, requires you to look at a given set of sources and demonstrate the following skills:

- Reading the source and understanding how it relates to the issue in the question.
- Looking at the provenance of the source and assessing how far this impacts on the validity of it as evidence about the issue in the question. (AS Question 1)
- Using your own knowledge of the period to assess the use or validity of the source.

These are skills that you have to transfer to the coursework. But, this is an essay and not a commentary on a given set of sources, so there is an additional skill. You have to select the sources and integrate critical treatment of evidence in an essay. However, the evaluation skills do have to be carried over from Unit 1.

Let's recap those skills. Let's say that you are investigating whether the rebellion of 1536 against Henry VIII was religious. As a starting point look at the rebels' demands. You might find these in an A-level textbook. You can read the whole document or you may use parts of it. In the examination you might have this:

The Pontefract Articles (1536)

The supremacy of the Church in matters of care of souls to be reserved to the See of Rome as before. The consecrations of the bishops to be from the Pope, with a reasonable payment for the outward defence of the Faith.

Interpretation: This shows the importance of religion because the rebels demanded a return of the supremacy of the Pope in spiritual matters.

Provenance: The Pontefract Articles were intended to rally as many people as possible to the cause of rebellion and might have emphasised religion to get maximum support.

Knowledge: The changes to the monasteries had been concerning and there was widespread resentment that

change had been pushed through by a clique at court. However, there were other causes of discontent, such as concern about the king's control of Parliament, so this extract does not give the whole picture.

This is only one source, but is a starting point for source evaluation. However, this is not an unseen source in an examination, so there is no problem in finding the whole document and looking at a range of grievances.

These include:

- That lady Mary may be made legitimate.
- Lord Cromwell and Sir Richard Rich have condign punishment, as subverters of the good laws of the realm and supporting heresy.
- All enclosures since Henry VII to be pulled down 'except mountains, forests, and parks'.

So looking at more than just short extracts can give you a better picture of the evidence. How does it modify the judgement on the Pontefract Articles?

Interpretation: Religious causes do dominate, but there are other factors, often linked. Cromwell and Rich were seen as subverting the good law of the realm and supporting heresy. So religion was linked to other grievances but given prominence.

Provenance: The framers of the demands in 1536 needed to reflect a range of grievances but stressed religion to get support. Rebellion was a very dangerous act and so religion was important to stress.

Knowledge: There had been rapid changes to the country since 1532 and religious faith had been undermined by the dissolution of the smaller monasteries, but the changes had also affected economic and social life. The demands reflected this. The dominance of Cromwell and Rich was resented by their political enemies and Cromwell's use of Parliament to pass **reformation** legislation appeared to undermine its independence, linking religious and secular issues.

How has reading the whole text changed the evaluation?

A

The research now has to be used in the context of a 4000-word essay.

Religion was an important element in the rebellion of 1536 and the Pontefract Articles issued by the rebels links most of their demands to religious grievances. Religion was a major motivating element and the demands were intended to justify rebellion and gather support. However, it was often difficult to separate religion and secular grievances. Cromwell was unpopular for more than just religious reasons, for instance. The North was concerned about loss of revenue and some of the economic consequences of the dissolution, so the demands need to be seen in a wider context.

A little research might yield more grievances that might support the link between religious and secular grievances.

My progress

Find a key piece of primary evidence about your own topic.

What does it say about the issue in the question?

Explain how its provenance (which might include typicality, completeness, origin, purpose) might be used to test it.

Explain what knowledge might be used to test it.

Now try writing a sample paragraph of your essay which uses that evidence.