CAMBRIDGE
INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level

MARK SCHEME FOR the November 2002 question papers

9697 HISTORY

9697/1	Paper 1 (Modern European History 1789-1939), maximum raw mark 100
9697/2	Paper 2 (Southeast Asia: From Colonies to Nations, 1870 to 1980) maximum raw mark 100
9697/3	Paper 3 (International History 1945-1991), maximum raw mark 100
9697/4	Paper 4 (The History of Tropical Africa, 1855-1914) maximum mark 100
9697/5	Paper 5 (History of the USA 1840-1968), maximum mark 100

These mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. They show the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. They do not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published *Report on the Examination*.

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 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 November 2002 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced Subsidiary (AS) Level syllabuses.

UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE
Local Examinations Syndicate

Paper 9697/1 MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY, 1789 - 1939

October / November 2002

SECTION A: THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR I, 1870 - 1914

Paper 1 Marking Notes

[Note: all papers are to be marked using the generic marking bands for source-based and essays questions.)

1 Source-Based Question

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

These answers write about the hostility between Germany's foreign policy but will ignore the question *'unreasonably aggressive'*, i.e. they will not use the sources as information / evidence to test the given hypothesis. 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 hypotheses.

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, 'Source B says that war should be welcomed and was approved by God. von Bülow in Source B gives an aggressive speech to the Reichstag and his audience was very enthusiastic. Source D proves German guilt and Source E can be ignored because it is heavily biased.'. Or alternatively, 'German foreign policy was not aggressive. Source A shows that Germany agreed to the Triple Alliance for defence. Source B accepts war but wants the army to be highly disciplined. Source C shows that von Bülow wants to be the equal of the other European countries but was not being aggressive. Source D is very unreliable about the true causes of World War I and Source E proves that Germany did not have aggressive aims.'.

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, 'There is evidence for and against the claim that German foreign policy was unreasonably aggressive. Source C claims that Germany was not being aggressive when it set up the Triple Alliance and would only go to war if one of the members was attacked. Source C agrees with this view because von Bülow did not intend to attack other countries but he was determined to stand up for Germany's interests. Source E also says that Germany did not want war and blames other countries for the conflict. However, Germany's aggression is evident in Source B because war should

be welcomed, not avoided. Source D emphasises that Germany was most responsible for causing the war.'.

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, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

For example, 'The Sources mostly support the claim that Germany's foreign policy was unreasonably aggressive. Although it does not mention any aggressive acts, the Triple Alliance in Source A was less important as a defence than as a means by which Germany could exert international power. von Moltke, the author of Source B, played an important part in forming German policy and his attitude to war in Source B was widely shared among German politicians and army officers. The tone used by von Bülow in Source C is intended to stir up his audience, not to calm down the fears of war. The Commission on War Guilt in Source D represented the universal feeling in 1919 about Germany's foreign policy. Monteglas's views must be treated with suspicion because he was interested only in justifying Germany, not in reaching an objective historical judgement.'.

L5 BY INTERPRETING AN EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FIND 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 conformation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example, (L4 plus) '...However, the Sources also point to another explanation. Source A is moderate whilst von Moltke in Source B was writing to a law expert and was therefore trying to justify the legality of German policy. In Source C, von Bülow was speaking to an audience of German politicians and his speech did not necessarily reflect his true opinions about war and aggression. The criticism of Germany in Source D was by its enemies and it is an exaggeration to claim that Germany and its allies were 'wholly responsible'. Source E is correct to point out that France was determined to regain Alsace Lorraine and Germany had to be ready to defend itself throughout this period against France.'.

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, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but why some evidence is worse.

For example, ' Although German policy was mostly aggressive during this

period, there is some evidence to challenge the claim that it was unreasonably so. The Triple Alliance in Source A was formed to defend Germany against France and the possibility of a powerful anti-German alliance. von Bülow's speech in Source C is more reliable as a statement of Germany's determination to be equal to other countries than of its wish to be aggressive. The claim in Source D about German War Guilt has now been discredited by some historians although it is possible to understand why the Commission came to this conclusion in 1919, when memories of the war were fresh. However, Source E is the least reliable Source. It contains some claims that were true, for example about France's aims, but France was not primarily responsible for the outbreak of the war. German policy was more aggressive.

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, 'The sources show that German policy was sometimes aggressive and at other times defensive. This inconsistency was the most important reason for the problems that led to the outbreak of World War I. Whilst Moltke in Source B admired war, like many of his fellow officers and many German politicians, other Sources, such as Sources A and C show that Germany felt threatened or least wanted to avoid being inferior to other European countries. A close reading of Source D shows that Germany's allies were also held responsible by the 1919 War Commission. The Source shows that Germany was not the only aggressive country. Although the claims in Source E are exaggerated, it is also possible to see evidence in it of German fears for its defence before World War I.

SECTION B

Essay Questions

2 The key issue is the reasons why the French Revolution became more radical during the years 1789 –1794. Examiners will look for a knowledge of developments during this period and an explanation of the changes. The question does not require accounts of the causes of the French Revolution but a view of the aims of the revolutionaries in 1789 will be very relevant. The first aim was to reform abuses within a responsible monarchy. However, Louis XVI's uncertain response and agitation, especially in Paris, gave rise to radicalism. Provincial divisions, the fears of foreign intervention and then war added to the pressures for more extreme measures. Louis XVI and his family were discredited by the flight to Varennes whilst the Jacobins gained power from their rivals. By 1794, the republic had been installed and Robespierre's regime carried out many extreme measures. A basic narrative can deserve 11-13 marks; a fuller narrative with few comments can get 14-15. 16+ will need more deliberate explanation. 22-25 can be awarded to answers that concentrate on analysis and which consider most of the reasons suggested above. However, because of the complexity of the events, it will be unreasonable to expect comprehensive answers. 19 - 21 answers will be analytical but will miss some possible lines of discussion

3 The key issue is the reasons for European industrialisation. Candidates are required to refer to developments in at least two countries. (The syllabus mentions Britain, France and Germany.) Answers which deal with only one country, e.g. British industrialisation, will be liable to a ceiling of 14 marks because they will demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding. Unbalanced answers can get up to 17. A 60:40 balance between two countries can merit any mark band. Discussion of a third country can be a bonus, depending on the success of this part, i.e. good discussions of 2 will be worth more than basic accounts of 3. Industrialisation depended particularly on growing populations, the availability of investment, new techniques and the spread of factories and the greater influence of urban middle classes. Agricultural problems led to increased urbanisation. Points such as these should be exemplified by reference to developments in the selected countries. It will be relevant to discuss the comparative periods of industrialisation. Britain was first. German (previously Prussia) benefited from economic policies such as the Zollverein and investment in railways. It developed new industries towards the end of the century. French industrialisation was later but benefited from the political, social and economic changes of the Third Republic. The question does not ask about the problems or consequences of industrialisation; such sections should be checked to confirm that they refer implicitly to reasons. Well-argued and supported answers should be awarded 22-25. Answers that are sound overall but with weaker passages in some minor areas can be given 18-21. 16-17 will require some valid comments to underpin the description whereas 11-13 and 14-15 answers will probably be very descriptive.

4 The key issue is the reasons for the lack of success of the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany and Italy. Answers should be reasonably balanced. 60: either way can lead to the highest mark band. A greater imbalance would normally lead to one band lower than would otherwise be awarded whilst a knowledge and understanding of one country only will be liable to a ceiling of 13. The revolutionaries were divided in their aims. In Italy, some wished for a united Italy, others for a federal

state, yet others preferred states' rights, only wishing to expel Austrian influence. Germany was divided between supporters of a larger and a smaller Germany: to include or exclude Austria. The revolutionaries lacked widespread support within Austria and Germany. They had insufficient military strength particularly when faced with Austrian armies. In Germany, the attitude of Prussia was probably crucial. The question does not involve an explanation of the causes of the revolution although some background will be relevant in showing the extent of the movements and their different aims. Adequate narrative can merit 11-13 with fuller narratives for 14-15. 16-17 will be the turning point between highly narrative essays and more considered responses. The top bands will be awarded for highly analytical answers. Some attempt to compare the revolutions as a synthesis should be made in 22-25 answers. On the other hand, vague discussions that fail to distinguish any particular characteristics will probably be worth fewer than 11 marks.

5 The key issue is the effects of imperialism in European countries during the later years of the nineteenth century. The question is not about causes although a link can be made. For example, imperialism aroused popular sentiment: colonies were welcomed by many as a means of national aggrandisement. Most candidates may accept the benefits uncritically: economic gain, raw materials, room for expansion. However, high credit should be given to those who can attempt a more critical approach. There is little evidence of real economic benefit. The colonies were expensive to maintain, for example involving defence costs. Another effect was the pressures created in European international relations. Arguments should be supported by examples but these need not be comprehensive. Candidates can select examples / knowledge from particular regions. A problem might be answers that deal only with British imperialism. This will be relevant but, lacking a European context, will normally be awarded a mark one band lower than would otherwise be given. Very descriptive accounts with a bare minimum of examples will lead to 11-13 marks. Fuller descriptions can be worth 14-15. 22- 25 can be awarded to varied and considered analyses with appropriate factual support. 19-21 answers will be mostly sound but will miss some possible lines of discussion.

6 The key issue is the reasons why Nicholas II's regime survived the revolution of 1905 but not that of 1917. A discriminating factor will be candidates' success in dealing with 1905. To get to 11-13 marks, answers must demonstrate a basic knowledge and understanding; essays that consider only 1917 cannot reach this level. 60:40 answers will usually tend towards an emphasis on 1914 but this can merit any mark band. A greater imbalance will normally lead to one band lower than that normally awarded. Many answers may be sequential: 1905 then 1917. This can deserve 22-25 if both parts are very good but this band should usually denote the ability to compare them and to provide an effective synthesis. For example, the army supported the Tsar in 1905 but not in 1917. Tsarist authority was still highly respected in 1905 but not in 1917. The extent of the opposition was more limited in 1905. 1917 saw the crucial problem of the war that caused the government, economy, society and military to crumble. Surveys of 1906-14 will be most effective when they show how far Nicholas II tried to respond to the need for change. Clear and well-supported analysis with some comparison can deserve 22-25. 19-21 answers will be mostly solid but will omit some very possible lines of discussion. 16-18 answers will combine valid comments and description. The lower bands will probably be highly descriptive or narrative.

7 The key issue is the similarities in the rise of Fascism in Italy and Nazism in Germany. Essays that are completely sequential with a brief reference to

similarities and differences can deserve up to 15. The higher bands will need a closer focus on the key issue. Answers should be reasonably balanced between Germany and Italy – 60:40 will be acceptable. Accounts of one country only will miss the key issue and will not deserve more than 13 marks. Many answers may be very narrative but the narrative should be limited to the rise of Fascism / Nazism i.e. approximately 1926, 1933-34. Later accounts will be treated with caution by examiners. When the two countries are referred to, basic descriptions will gain 11-13 marks. Fuller accounts with little comment will merit 14-15. 16-17 will require more explanation to interpret the knowledge. Sound analyses will deserve the highest bands. Answers may discuss the common features of the world-war experience and the post-war settlements, although these were harsher on Germany than Italy. Liberal democracies seemed weak. There were fears of Communism. Both Fascism and Nazism promised to restore order, national greatness and economic stability. 22-25 and most 19-21 answers should consider some differences, implied in 'How similar...?'. Differences lay in timing. Mussolini gained power when Hitler was still planning an unsuccessful coup. Racialism was stronger in Germany than in Italy.

8 The key issue is the social and economic differences between Russia and western Europe before 1914. This is a cross-sectional question and candidates need to be able to bring together their different knowledge and understanding. Social and economic issues are important; answers that only consider political structures will not be relevant. However, up to 21 marks can be awarded to essays that do not distinguish between social and economic aspects. 22-25 answers should demonstrate better organisation. Up to 15 marks can be given for highly sequential answers which are relevant but in which the similarities and differences are implied more than defined. Answers on Russia alone will not address the key issue. However, essays which are more confident about Russia and which deal with western Europe generally will be acceptable for up to 18 marks. More specific examples should characterise the highest bands. Russian society had a larger proportion of rural peasants than western Europe. There was a comparatively small middle class. The aristocracy was more important socially than that of western Europe, especially France, although the status of the aristocracy in Germany and, to a lesser extent, Britain should not be underestimated. The social structure was more inflexible than in western Europe. A similar feature was the growing urban working class (proletariat). The Russian economy was more agricultural and less industrialised although Russian industry was moving towards a western pattern. The country had more raw materials but problems in communications (fewer railways and a smaller fleet) hindered development. There was less internal investment and it depended largely on French investment and other foreign loans. Russian industry, whilst growing, was less innovative than British or German. Agricultural methods were more outdated but Russia managed largely to feed itself. There was less impetus for agricultural reform.