

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2009 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9697 HISTORY

9697/11

Paper 11, maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

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

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2009 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697	11

GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Examiners will assess which Level of Response best reflects most of the answer. An answer will not be required to demonstrate all of the descriptions in a particular Level to qualify for a Mark Band. In bands of 3 marks, examiners will normally award the middle mark, moderating it up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer. In bands of 2 marks, examiners should award the lower mark if an answer just deserves the band and the higher mark if the answer clearly deserves the band.

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
1	21–25	The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material and ideas. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The best answers must be awarded 25 marks.
2	18–20	Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided.
3	16–17	Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.
4	14–15	Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively.
5	11–13	Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.
6	8–0	Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.
7	0–7	Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent. Marks at the bottom of this Band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answers usually make at least a few valid points.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697	11

Section A: The Origins of World War I, 1870 – 1914

Source-based question: Analysis and Evaluation

- 1 'Britain's fear of the German navy before World War I was completely justified.'
Use Sources A–E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2–3]	EVALUATION [L4–5]	CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER (e.g. Contextual knowledge)
A	The Germans widely believe that criticism of their ship-building programme by Britain is unjustified. There is no equivalent criticism of the increased navies of other countries. Germany's naval increase began after Britain introduced a ship-building programme.	Y – Nothing. N – The Germans had a grievance against unjust criticism. The reasons are that Germany was being singled out, the Germany navy was not intended to threaten Britain and Britain had begun the naval race.	Y – It is significant that the Source appeared in a British journal but it is not possible to discern from the extract how typical it was of feeling in Britain. N – Nothing.	Y – Agrees with E. There is particular agreement with E over the Germans' sense of grievance. N – Contradicts C and D. D introduces a variant in the accusation of Germany spying which underlines Germany's aggression.	Y – Germany did feel aggrieved that the wider increase in ship-building was being ignored. Countries other than those mentioned increased their navies e.g. Russia. Britain did believe that Germany's increase was unnecessarily large. Y/N It is difficult now to decide who began the naval race. N – Germany was not forced to follow Britain's example. Its traditional policies were dominated by land interests.
B	Germany had to maintain a strong army against the combined threats of France and Germany. It could not afford also to build a navy that would threaten Britain.	Y – Nothing. N – The Source emphasises German naval weakness against Britain. Germany's military priorities were on land in view of its weak strategic position between France and Russia.	Y – The Source ignores the considerable amount of money that was in fact being spent on the German navy at that time. N – Although an anonymous article, it can be accepted as typical of much feeling in Germany at the time. The increase in German spending did not result in German naval superiority.	Y – Agrees with A and E that Germany could not present a major danger to Britain, including the variant about the limitations of the German economy. N – Contradicts C and D which see Germany presenting a major threat to British security.	Y – The military balance was correct and Germany's economy could not sustain a growth in armies and navy. N – The writer ignores the fact that Germany did in fact embark on a very major naval expansion.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697	11

C	<p>Whereas the navy was a necessary defence for Britain, a large navy was an unnecessary luxury for Germany. Britain was not anti-German and had not forced Germany to strengthen its navy.</p>	<p>Y – Britain was a traditionally strong naval power whereas Germany had relied more on its army in the nineteenth century.</p> <p>N – Whilst Germany was not forced to enter the naval race by Britain, Britain's increasing navy was seen as a challenge.</p>	<p>Y – Churchill represented a strong political view that was accompanied also by considerable public jingoism demanding a larger and newer fleet.</p> <p>N – The British Admiralty was strongly in favour of a larger navy. (Candidates will not be expected to know particularly about Churchill's position and views in 1912.) The writer was not objective. There were also some in the British government who were less convinced.</p>	<p>Y – Supported by D.</p> <p>N – Contradicted by A (note: a British publication), B and E.</p>	<p>Y – The navy was at the heart of British diplomacy and military thinking. Britain had a very small army.</p> <p>N – Germany did require a navy as part of its great-power status. It is possible to argue that British fears were exaggerated in this respect.</p>
D	<p>The stationing of the German navy was a direct threat to British security and was not only intended to protect Germany's world-wide interests. Germany organised a spy network to gather information about British land and sea plans.</p>	<p>Y – Germany did position much of its fleet in the North Sea.</p> <p>Y/N – There were considerable fears of German spies. Germany did organise spies but so did all other countries, including Britain.</p>	<p>Y – The inter-governmental note would try to give as accurate a picture as possible. The factual information in the first paragraph is accurate.</p> <p>Y/N – Spy scares were commonplace at that time. The fears were exaggerated. However, countries did employ spies.</p>	<p>Y – Confirmed by but also goes beyond C in its accusations of spying.</p> <p>N – Contradicted by A (a British publication), B and E.</p>	<p>Y – Germany did station a powerful navy near to the North Sea, i.e. close to the British mainland and British key interests, such as the Belgian and French ports. The opening of the Kiel Canal was ominous.</p> <p>N – The spy scares were very probably exaggerated.</p>
E	<p>Although it was inferior in size and experience, the German navy was proud to defend its country in the face of unwarranted British superiority.</p>	<p>Y – Nothing.</p> <p>N – Germany had not attained equality, less superiority, with the British fleet. The German fleet was also less experienced.</p> <p>N – The newly-built German warships were also very modern, and in some respects superior.</p>	<p>Y – Scheer was representative of many Germans, especially in government and the Admiralty. It is mostly a realistic appraisal of the relative strengths of the two navies.</p> <p>N – Scheer was trying to justify Germany in his Memoirs.</p>	<p>Y – Supported by A and B. To some extent, recognises the British naval tradition.</p> <p>N – Contradicted by C and D.</p>	<p>Y – The German navy and its sailors were less experienced. The navy had mostly been involved in more distant regions ('half-civilised or savage races') as a result of the search for colonial expansion.</p> <p>N – Germany could not have been sure that Britain would join France and Russia, although this was feared. Scheer ignored the deep suspicions in Britain.</p>

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697	11

1 Source-Based Question

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES [1–5]

These answers write generally about 1914 but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss 'Britain's fear of the German navy before World War I was completely justified' but will describe events very generally. Include in this level answers which use information taken from the sources but only in providing a summary of views expressed by the writers, rather than for testing the hypothesis.

L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6–8]

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context.

For example, 'Britain's fear of the German navy before World War I was completely justified. Sources C and D show that it was necessary to Britain to maintain dominance at sea whereas Germany's primary strength was on land. Therefore, Germany was not justified in challenging Britain's navy. Source D points out that the German fleet was not stationed to protect its colonies but was a strong threat to Britain itself because it was positioned in the North Sea. This extract also notes the German's use of a spy network, which justified British fears of Germany's intentions.'

L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [9–13]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disconfirm it. However, sources are used only at face value.

For example, 'On the other hand, Sources A, B and E deny that the German navy was a threat to Britain. Source A points out that the Germans were aggrieved because they were being singled out, and that the Germans were provoked into building more warships because Britain began the naval race. Source B shows the impossibility of the German economy supporting a large army and a large navy. Source E describes the resentment in Germany at Britain's naval superiority which might always keep Germany weak. The British navy was much more efficient than the German navy.'

L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [14–16]

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis and by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

For example, 'The claim that 'Germany's invasion of Belgium in 1914 was completely unjustifiable' can be proved from an evaluation of the sources. Although Churchill's speech in Source C is not completely reliable because he would defend the British navy, being in charge of the Admiralty, he makes some valid points. The navy was the basis of British military power. It had been strong before the naval race with Germany. Germany, on the other hand, was departing from its traditional military strength on land to build a challenging navy. Source D has value because the Admiralty is accurate in showing that the Germany navy was stationed in the North Sea, where it would be a direct threat to Britain. The Germany spy system was also worrying.'

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697	11

- L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [17–21]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example, (L4 plus) ‘...However, the sources can also be interpreted to show that the threat from the German navy was exaggerated. Source A is particularly strong evidence. It describes the discontent in Germany but was published in a British journal. The author is anonymous but it is unlikely that the journal would usually be anti-British. Whilst Source B is from a German naval journal and might therefore be expected to favour Germany, it does describe a widespread feeling that Germany was surrounded by two strong powers which together would be more powerful than Germany. The point about the German economy is also valid.’

- L6 AS L5, PLUS **EITHER** (a) EXPLAIN WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE/SUPPORT IS BETTER/PREFERRED, **OR** (b) RECONCILES/EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED. [22–25]

For (a), the argument must be that the evidence for challenging or supporting the claim is more justified. This must involve a comparative judgement, not simply why some evidence is better, but why some evidence is worse.

For example, ‘Although there is evidence in the Sources both to challenge and support the claim Britain’s fear of the German navy before World War I was completely justified, the more convincing case supports the claim. Although only two of the five extracts support the claim, these two make very convincing points about the German navy and the priority that Britain had to give to its navy. Whilst Source A is correct that many nations built more powerful navies before World War I, the crucial naval rivalry was between Britain and Germany. Britain had a weak land army. Stationing the bulk of its fleet in the North Sea, as shown in Source D, was a direct challenge to Britain and contradicted the German claim that its ships were intended primarily to defend its colonies. Scheer’s views in Source E cannot be given much weight because he was mostly concerned to defend Germany and in particular its navy. Source B is correct that Germany’s priority was the land threat from France and Russia but this did not prevent it challenging Britain at sea, whatever the state of its economy.’

OR

Although there is evidence in the Sources both to challenge and support the claim that Britain’s fear of the German navy before World War I was completely justified, the more convincing case supports the claim. However, it must be remembered that many German politicians and military leaders believed that Germany was weaker than the Triple Entente. Germany could rely only on Austria and Italy and these were not strong militarily. Therefore, a navy might be needed to hold the balance with Britain if Britain intervened on the side of France and Russia. To some extent, the claim in Source A that Britain began the naval race is true. Source B’s point that the army was a priority to Germany was true and the size of its navy did not seriously challenge the British fleet. Although Scheer’s sympathies are clearly with Germany in Source E, his point about the comparative experience of the British and German fleets in war is justified.’

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it.

For example, ‘An alternative explanation is that both Britain and Germany failed to understand the concerns of the other because they were in rival alliances. The suspicions between them are demonstrated strongly in Source D with its description of Germany spies. Britain did feel that the very basis of its power was threatened whilst Germany never came close to achieving naval superiority.’

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697	11

Section B

Essay Questions

- 2 'The economic difficulties of France in 1789 were more serious than the political problems.' How far do you agree with this judgement?

The key issues are the problems of France in 1789. Candidates must end in 1789, either with the opening of the Estates-General or the end of the year. Candidates can spend more time on what are perceived as the more serious problems but one might normally expect about a 60:40 balance for answers in the two highest bands. Band 5 will require a basic knowledge and understanding of one category of problems. Royal finances were weak. The costs of war were high. The most important nobles and the Church paid little or no tax. Some lesser nobles, who had offices, paid a small 'tax' as the price of holding them. Some bourgeois were able to evade many financial impositions. The peasantry bore a heavy burden. Tax collection through tax farmers was inefficient. Attempts at reform by controllers-general were foiled by nobles and the Church who influenced Louis XVI. The late 1780s saw poor harvests with particularly devastating effects on the peasantry. Most of the demands of the *cahiers* from the Third Estate were economic, whereas the First and Second Estates looked for political solutions. Louis XVI's absolutism was accepted almost universally but was not unlimited. Candidates might discuss the personal weakness of the King. Royal *intendants* were often thwarted by powerful nobles. The *parlements* proved troublesome. The Assembly of Notables was potentially useful but was not a solution. The Estates-General seemed to be the best hope of a representative body. If candidates continue beyond the decision to call the Estates-General, they might deal with the unrest in Paris and then in the provinces (*Grande Peur*). They might examine the Declaration of the Rights of Man. The assumption by the Third Estate of the title 'National Assembly' and the nobles' surrender of some of their privileges can be regarded mostly as political moves. The removal of Louis XVI from Versailles to Paris might also be seen as an important political step.

- 3 Why have the industrial changes in the nineteenth century been described as a 'revolution'? (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is the nature of the industrial 'revolution'. There is no need to explain explicitly the nature of revolutions. This can be done effectively but it might also lead to rambling accounts. Examiners will look for an awareness of the range, scale and significance of change. Less successful answers might be confined to some narrow descriptions of changes but the more effective responses will show an appreciation of widespread change. However, the topic is large (and in some respects undefined) so that examiners should not look primarily for gaps. Even the best answers are likely to have limits in their treatment. Industrialisation involved a capitalist-moneyed, instead of an agrarian-based, economy. Industry was organised mostly in factories instead of comparatively small cottage-enterprises. There were also new industries and a transformation of older industries. Towns became more important than rural areas for wealth. The new steam power played an important role in a variety of ways. Communications developed significantly. Social structures changed. Whilst peasants remained the single largest class, the urban working class/proletariat was economically more important, although not necessarily more prosperous. The middle class benefited. The nobility survived but did best when it participated in industrial undertakings. There were political effects. Autocratic governments had to come to terms with pressures from the new classes, sometimes by allowing political concessions and sometimes by social amelioration. Socialism and Marxism were industrial political theories that were considered revolutionary. The question asks candidates to refer to at least two of Britain, France and Germany because this might help them to avoid vagueness. Marks will not depend on whether two or three countries are included but examiners will look for some specific examples to support arguments.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697	11

4 How different were the aims and methods of Cavour from those of Mazzini?

The key issue is the comparison/contrast of Cavour and Mazzini. For marks in Bands 1 and 2, examiners will expect a reasonable balance; 60:40 either way might be appropriate. Band 5 will require an adequate knowledge and understanding of one of Cavour and Mazzini. Examiners should not automatically mark down answers that are structured sequentially. Such answers might in fact contain valid comparisons/contrasts. Cavour believed in firm, even autocratic government (whilst recognising the value of parliament) whereas Mazzini put his faith in popular revolution and democracy. Cavour's priority was to promote Piedmont's interests. He favoured a strengthening of Piedmont's power in the north of Italy and it can be argued that he was forced into accepting union with the south because of Garibaldi's achievements. Mazzini was dedicated to the union of all Italy. Cavour was sufficiently realistic about the need for foreign assistance to exclude Austria both for military and political reasons. Mazzini believed in Italians' efforts alone and was viewed with widespread suspicion in countries other than Austria. Cavour was willing to go to war but saw war as an element in diplomacy, as shown in the intervention in the Crimean War and by the agreement with Napoleon III at Plombières. He was even willing to surrender Nice and Savoy, which Mazzini would not have contemplated. Cavour was a monarchist whereas Mazzini was a republican. Although he transformed Italy, Cavour can be seen as working within the system whereas Mazzini was always an outsider. A study of specific developments, such as Mazzini's attempted revolutions in the 1830s and in 1848-49, and Cavour's achievements in 1858-61 can be used to highlight the contrast. Cavour died in 1861 and the question therefore excludes long discussion of the period from 1862 to 1871 except that candidates might use it to highlight their ultimate effectiveness in a brief conclusion.

5 'The main reason why continental European countries were involved in 'New Imperialism' in the late nineteenth century was jealousy of Britain.' How far do you agree with this judgement?

'How far..?' means that candidates should consider the stated explanation of Imperialism but do not have to agree with it. Candidates can consider a wide variety of reasons but should show adequate understanding of the claim about 'jealousy of Britain' to reach Bands 1 or 2. Britain was the first country to develop a powerful overseas empire. By the late nineteenth century, it controlled India, white possessions such as Canada and Australia, valuable islands in the West Indies and strategic centres in Africa. There were outposts in south-east Asia. Wherever other European states sought to expand, it would probably mean competition with Britain. Reference might be made to French attempts to build influence in north Africa where Britain was already involved. Germany, under William II, challenged Britain in parts of Africa and gave controversial support to the Boers. However, alternative arguments can be proposed. Empire-building was seen as worthwhile in its own right, delivering economic benefits and political advantages. There were also religious impulses, linked to Social Darwinism. Belgium might be seen as an example of personal ambition by Leopold II. Italy was motivated by the desire for great-power status but not particularly by jealousy of Britain. Whereas moderate answers, perhaps up to Band 3, might provide surveys of reasons of varying quality, answers in Band 2 and especially Band 1 should make an overt attempt to explain what the main reason was. Another characteristic of the answers in the two highest Bands will be the appropriateness/quality (but not necessarily the quantity) of overseas examples. The topic is wide and therefore even the best answers will be selective of examples in the available time.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697	11

6 How serious were the dangers to the tsarist government of Russia from 1900 to the outbreak of war in 1914?

The key issues are the dangers to Nicholas II's government. Candidates might come to two contrasting conclusions, either that the dangers showed a deep instability in tsarist rule or that the dangers were not particularly threatening. Candidates might judge that a danger to tsarist rule was Nicholas II himself. He was averse to change when change was affecting all of the major states in Europe. Whilst he was authoritarian, he was also indecisive and prone to look for advice to unsuitable advisers. The Russo-Japanese War (1904-05) exposed Russia's military and naval weaknesses but it also affected the political reputation of the government. Candidates can assess the danger posed by the Revolution of 1905. Beginning in St. Petersburg (Bloody Sunday), unrest spread to other cities and agrarian regions. The battleship 'Potemkin' mutinied. However, it was not coordinated and radical groups such as the socialists played a minor part. The concession of the October Manifesto was partly effective although the Tsar wasted the opportunity to introduce changes by the introduction of the Fundamental Laws that reinforced autocracy. Candidates can examine the significance of the ministries of Witte and Stolypin. They modernised parts of the economy and secured foreign investment. However, large debts had to be repaid and the condition of most Russians probably did not improve. Stolypin combined reforms to encourage the kulaks with stern repression and attempted wider social changes. However, his success is arguable and he never won the confidence of Nicholas II and the conservative court. On the other hand, it can be argued that radical groups were divided and largely ineffective during this period. Lenin and other Bolshevik leaders were in external or internal exile. The police system was strong and the Tsar was supported by the army. The economy, whatever its problems, was improving.

7 How far do you agree that Hitler's power in Germany from 1933 to 1939 relied mainly on terror?

The key issues are the reasons for Hitler's power in Germany. Terror might be associated with violence and wide police powers. Hitler used the SA (Brownshirts) before he came to power to crush opponents and impose the Nazi party on critics. On coming to power, he wished to win the support of the army who were suspicious of the SA. Röhm also advocated a continuous revolution. The leaders of the SA were destroyed in the Night of the Long Knives (1934). However, this did not mean an end to terror. The SS, under Himmler, enjoyed considerable power and was a brutal force. The Gestapo was formed by Göring in 1933. Terror was employed against real or imagined enemies of the Nazis; these included minority racial groups, especially the Jews (although the worst aspects of the Holocaust appeared after 1939), communists, liberals and homosexuals. Censorship was extensive. Newspapers, radio and films justified terror as determined action to suppress enemies of the people. The courts did not interfere with the excesses of the regime. Non-compliant judges were dismissed. On the other hand, it can be argued that Hitler gained popularity by his appeals to German interests, the promise to overcome the humiliation of Versailles, economic programmes that saw strong state intervention but also benefited Big Business, and propaganda that was orchestrated by Goebbels. Hitler personally had a powerful appeal, for example through stage-managed speeches and films. Much was made of social reforms although their extent and effectiveness were exaggerated. It will not be necessary and probably irrelevant to narrate the details of foreign policy to 1939 but candidates can point out that the Anschluss with Austria was popular as was Hitler's display of concern for German minorities in other east European countries.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697	11

8 Explain which had the greater effect on Europe by 1939: World War I or the Russian Revolution.

The key issue is the comparative effect of World War I and the Russian Revolution on Europe by 1939. Candidates can give more time to the phenomenon that they judge to be more important but a certain balance should still be maintained. For marks in Bands 1 and 2, examiners will expect a reasonable balance; 60:40 either way might be appropriate. Band 5 will require an adequate knowledge and understanding of the effects of either World War I or the Russian Revolution. World War I helped to establish weak democracies in central Europe but, perhaps more importantly, it helped to bring dictatorships to power. Reference might be made to Germany, Italy and Russia. It had severe economic effects on the participants in the war and indirect consequences by creating unstable conditions after 1918. Particular reference might be made to the effects of reparations on Germany. The war continued to affect diplomacy, especially with the arguments over the best way in which to deal with Germany. Within Germany itself, the war continued to have an impact on the Weimar Republic then on the Nazi regime. There might be little on social effects because these are largely outside the scope of the syllabus. The Russian Revolution obviously affected Russia most but some good candidates might argue that the war created the conditions for the dominance of Lenin and the Bolsheviks and therefore indirectly of Stalin. Communism was largely confined to Russia to 1939. There were communist movements in other European countries, for example in France and Germany, but they failed to win power and were perhaps most important as the focus of right-wing animosity. Stalin gave intermittent and ultimately unsuccessful help to the Republicans in the Spanish Civil War. Candidates are very unlikely to be aware of the cultural aspects of communism in the inter-war period.