

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2009 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9697 HISTORY

9697/01

Paper 1, 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 May/June 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 – May/June 2009	9697	01

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 or 4 marks, examiners will normally award the middle mark/one of the middle marks, 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	8–10	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 – May/June 2009	9697	01

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

Source-Based Question: Analysis and Evaluation

1 'Germany's invasion of Belgium in 1914 was completely unjustifiable.' 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	A report of German origin. It is from a semi-official newspaper and therefore was probably published with the approval of the government. The time is some months before the final crisis but relations between Germany and France, involving Belgium, are already difficult.	Germany would maintain Belgian neutrality, recognising the obligations of international treaties it had agreed to.	Y – probably a reliable account of what happened in the meeting. N – The Source is very partial. Much is omitted, including other parts of the discussion.	Y – Agrees with B and, to some extent, E. However, all three are German sources and there is no support from other countries. Agrees with C about treaty guarantees to Belgium. N – Disagrees with D and, to some extent, E. D views Belgian neutrality as a key issue leading to war. E does not see Belgian neutrality as crucial to Britain.	Y – Germany had confirmed promise of Belgian neutrality, agreed by Prussia and other major states, 1839. N – Schlieffen Plan was based on an attack through Belgium. The Plan linked German war intentions in east and west.
B	An official German communiqué. The timing is at the height of the pre-war crisis.	Germany claims that France threatened Belgian neutrality. Germany should therefore go reluctantly to weak Belgium's aid. Germany might be forced to enter Belgium but would pay for any damage caused.	Y – It has some reliability inasmuch as the message was delivered. Germany did offer to recompense Belgium if Belgium accepted the German army on its territory. N – The doubts are considerable. The claims about French intentions are dubious although Germany did fear action by France. Germany's intentions towards Belgium are unrealistic.	Y – Source E confirms Germany's fears leading to claims that it acted in self-defence. N – C expresses Belgium's strong opposition to any disregard of its neutrality. D sees German action against Belgium as intolerable and a cause of war.	Y – Germany did fear an attack by France. Germany was not hostile to Belgium itself. N – Germany probably knew that France had no intentions to attack Germany through Belgium. The promise to make recompense was a cynical ploy.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2009	9697	01

C	An official Belgian communiqué sent the day after Source B.	Belgium rejects Source B, asserting the importance of its neutrality. There was no justification for this being ignored by Germany.	Y – It is reliable inasmuch as it is an official communiqué. Each of the statements can be confirmed. N – No valid grounds to doubt validity.	Y – A and D confirm the treaty-status of Belgium. N – B and E see Germany acting in self-defence.	Y – Belgium relied on the 1839 Treaty of London, guaranteed by major European states. It had a weak army. It rejected offers of protection from France and Britain. N – no contrary evidence.
D	A popular British newspaper. It seems to quote directly from speeches and statements from leading British politicians and diplomats. The opening statement represents a comment from a British point of view.	The British government's stance focused on its treaty obligations to maintain Belgian neutrality. War was declared after Germany had invaded Belgium.	Y – the Source contains speeches and statements that probably were made; these can be confirmed from other knowledge. N – Popular newspapers must be treated with caution. The extract is one-sided.	Y – supports views in A and C about Belgium's treaty-status. N – Contradicts B's view, repeated in E, that Germany's actions were justified. The importance of the Belgian issue is contradicted in E.	Y – The sequence of events can be confirmed. Britain did have treaty obligations to uphold Belgian neutrality. N – Britain did not make it clear until a late date that an invasion of Belgium would be a <i>casus belli</i> . (Some historians claim that Britain considered violating Belgian neutrality to ensure its North Sea interests but candidates are unlikely to know this.)
E	A newspaper interview with a leading German politician on the same day as the publication of Source D. Except for Source A, all of the sources come from a very narrow time period.	The Source claims that the treaty guaranteeing Belgian independence was of minor importance in persuading Britain to go to war. Germany's actions were forced on it and it was willing to pay compensation. British criticism of Germany's actions was unjustified.	Y – Bethmann-Hollweg was a major German politician who was close to events. He represented a widespread view in Germany that Belgian neutrality should not be important to Britain. There were other reasons for Britain's declaration of war, as Bethmann-Hollweg hints. N – Bethmann-Hollweg ignores the effects on other countries of Germany's invasion of Belgium.	Y – Supports B about self-defence and claims to support A's view of the importance of neutrality guarantees to Belgium. N – Contradicts B and D, claiming that Belgium was not the real issue with Britain.	Y – Belgium was a major issue for Britain but not the only reason for war with Germany e.g. naval interests. N – Germany was probably more responsible than Britain for the failure of negotiations to remove tensions. Ultimately, Belgian neutrality was more than 'a scrap of paper' to Britain.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2009	9697	01

Marking Notes

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

1 Source-Based Question

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

These answers write generally about the causes of the 1914 war 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 'Germany's invasion of Belgium in 1914 was completely unjustifiable' 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. Alternatively, the sources might be ignored in a general essay answer.

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, 'Germany's invasion of Belgium in 1914 was completely unjustifiable as is shown in Sources A, C and D. Source A explains that German had international obligations to recognise Belgian neutrality and had no plans to break this. Source C explains the viewpoint of the Belgian government. Belgium relied on the guarantees that had been given by treaties to which Germany had agreed, that Germany's request for free passage through Belgium was rejected, and that there could be no justification for breaking its neutrality. Source D shows that Britain maintained the importance of Belgian neutrality but that Belgium had been invaded unjustifiably by Germany.'

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, Germany was justified in invading Belgium. Source B describes the German feeling that France was prepared to attack Germany through Belgium and that Germany would be acting in self-defence. Source E has the view that Belgian neutrality was not a serious issue and that Germany had more important concerns. Britain exaggerated the significance of the invasion of Belgium.'

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2009	9697	01

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 claim that Germany's invasion of Belgium in 1914 was completely unjustifiable can be proved from an evaluation of the sources. Source A is a from a German semi-official newspaper, which probably represented correctly the views of the German government. It shows that, only a few months before the beginning of the war, Germany was claiming to have no plans to violate Belgian neutrality. However, the Schlieffen Plan was the basis of Germany's war plans and this included the invasion of Belgium. German strategy was not based only on a war in the east. Although Source B is an official message by the German government to the Belgian government, it is unreliable about the claim that France intended to attack Germany through Belgium. French war plans were based on a war against Germany in another direction. The facts about international treaties to which Source C refers are true. Most of Source D is also based factually on diplomatic exchanges between Britain and Germany. Source E should not be taken at face value. Bethmann-Hollweg was trying to justify German actions after his country had invaded Belgium and he does not make any credible points to justify the invasion of Belgium.'

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 Germany did have some justification. Source B shows that Germany was not concerned about a direct threat from Belgium but rather feared an attack through Belgium from France. Source E can be used as evidence that Britain had not made its intentions sufficiently clear to Germany and was using Belgium as an excuse to justify its wider animosity to Germany.'

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2009	9697	01

- 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 there is evidence in the Sources both to challenge and support the claim that Germany's invasion of Belgium in 1914 was completely unjustifiable, the more convincing case supports the claim. Whilst publicly Germany promised to recognise Belgian neutrality, its war plans, especially the Schlieffen Plan, were based on an attack on France to defeat that country quickly in the west before turning on Russia in the east. A quick victory could only be achieved through Belgium because of the strength of French defences elsewhere. The offer of friendly neutrality and the payment of compensation in Source B would obviously be unacceptable to an independent Belgium. It could only be explained by Germany's wish to present its case in as favourable a light as possible. Source E tries to confuse the situation by drawing attention to matters outside Belgium. The tensions between Britain and Germany were not a justification for the invasion of Belgium.'

OR

'Although there is evidence in the Sources both to challenge and support the claim that Germany's invasion of Belgium in 1914 was completely unjustifiable, the more convincing case supports the claim. However, it must be remembered that Germany was afraid of encirclement by Britain, France and Russia. Some Germany politicians and military officials saw the war as one of defence, and therefore German security justified the attack on Belgium. Britain did come out strongly against Germany's actions but could have made its attitude and the likelihood of war clear at an earlier date. To Germany, Belgium was a small problem in the context of the combination of its enemies in the Triple Entente.'

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 Germany miscalculated the effects of its invasion of Belgium. It felt justified in acting first because it feared the combined weights of the French and Russian armies and was not convinced that Britain would intervene. Although some people in Germany had aggressive intentions, others believed that Germany was in danger and that it had to act promptly before its enemies gained strength. The invasion of Belgium was a gamble taken in the belief that France could be defeated quickly and that Britain would avoid war. It was an unwise gamble because the invasion of Belgium brought into the war two powerful western enemies who were able to deny Germany the quick victory that it sought.'

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2009	9697	01

Section B

Essay Questions

2 Why was Napoleon Bonaparte able to become Emperor of France?

The key issue is the creation of the Empire by Napoleon Bonaparte. The Question asks 'Why' and examiners will be looking for analysis when awarding the two highest Bands. It will be relevant to explain the background to Napoleon's rise to show his appeal after the instability of the previous decade. However, surveys need to be linked to the Empire to get a high reward. Napoleon offered military success in the revolutionary wars especially against Austria; the failure of the Egyptian campaign was offset by propaganda. He also gained support because of his ability to put down insurrection and disorder within France. He managed to outmanoeuvre colleagues in the Consulate and caught the imagination of France by establishing the Empire, promising to safeguard the ideals of the Revolution and maintain order. He had pursued populist policies, for example in the Codes and through the Concordat. War was not a heavy expense for the French people but made Napoleon's reputation. Even the Egyptian expedition did not reflect badly on him. It will not be necessary, and probably irrelevant, to narrate the developments of foreign relations and campaigns but candidates can point out the resulting popularity within France. Although the Empire contradicted the republicanism that was at the heart of the French Revolution from 1792, it promised to maintain the ideals of the Revolution whilst, at the same time, ensuring order and efficiency. Some, such as extreme royalists and Jacobins, were not reconciled but Napoleon's autocracy and the establishment of the Empire were not seriously threatened by other people or alternative ideas.

3 Explain the main differences between pre-industrial and industrial societies in nineteenth-century Europe. (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is the contrast between pre-industrial and industrial societies. Candidates will probably write more about industrialised societies but examiners will look for a reasonable balance when awarding marks in the two highest Bands. Some might stretch the interpretation of 'society' to include 'economy' and this will not necessarily be irrelevant because both societies had an economic basis. However, candidates need to take care when describing mechanical inventions and developments to link them to the Question. 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. Pre-industrial societies were based overwhelmingly on land. The ownership of land gave social status and underpinned the social hierarchy. However, there were groups, especially in towns, that were outside the landed system. The bourgeoisie should not be ignored. Industrial societies saw a greater emphasis on moneyed wealth. Employers were in a different relationship to their employees. Large towns and cities grew and a higher proportion of the population lived in them. The speed and extent of this development varied between the three countries but it was a common factor during the course of the nineteenth century. The bourgeoisie/middle classes became more important. However, the nobles retained their pre-eminent social position although it was sustained partly by marriage with wealthy middle-class families and sometimes by investment in industry. Industrial development brought prominence to new provinces, aided by the availability of raw materials and better communications, for example the railways. Some candidates might discuss the decline of traditional social influences such as the Church.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2009	9697	01

4 'Bismarck did not plan the unification of Germany. He merely reacted to events.' How far do you agree with this judgement on the period from 1862 to 1871?

The key issue is Bismarck's view of German unification. Candidates are not required to have knowledge of the historiography of this topic but might refer to different views generally. There is a view, partly based on a feeling of inevitability, admiration for Bismarck's prowess and his own claims after unification had been achieved, that German unification was carefully planned. A counter-view is that he sought primarily to secure Prussia's position, and especially the position of William I against the Liberals, took advantage of the (often mistaken) policies of other states and ended by establishing the new German Empire in 1871. Some candidates might adopt one argument wholeheartedly. This might deserve a mark in Band 1 if argued effectively. However, answers in this band will normally need some consideration of both judgements. On the other hand, this is not a Question in which examiners will look for a balanced argument. The question begins in 1862 and candidates should take care when referring to earlier development but it will not be irrelevant to point out that Bismarck had already developed strong anti-Austrian feelings when he was a Prussian representative at the Diet. His appointment was due to pressures on the Prussian monarch from the Liberals, especially over the army budget. His early preoccupations were to defeat these Liberals and to disarm and weaken Austria, for example in the Schleswig-Holstein and Austro-Prussian Wars (1864 and 1866). Candidates might consider how far Bismarck was responsible for provoking these crises. The largely Protestant North German Confederation, dominated by Prussia, might well have been as far as Bismarck wished to go at that point. There are different explanations of developments to 1871. Did he provoke France, which was a danger because of its potential links to the largely Catholic southern German states, or was he pushed because of Napoleon III's mistaken diplomacy? Certainly, Bismarck used the Ems Telegram as a device to provoke both French and German opinion but the linked issues of the Spanish succession and the Hohenzollern Candidature were not of his making. Bismarck ensured that Prussia also dominated the new Germany.

5 How far did European governments support imperial expansion in the later nineteenth century because of the pressure of public opinion?

'How far..?' means that candidates should consider the stated explanation of Imperialism but do not have to agree with it. If other reasons are considered to be more important, public opinion can occupy a relatively small space in answers. However, answers in Bands 1 and 2 should contain an adequate discussion of public opinion. Some excellent answers might argue that governments were often forced into imperial adventures in order to placate public opinion. For example, Disraeli and Bismarck were both initially reluctant to engage in imperialism but both came to see the domestic advantages. The public saw colonies as evidence of a country's strength. They were attracted by the stories of individuals whose heroism or self-sacrifice made them popular heroes. Livingstone and the epic search of Stanley were British examples, Karl Peters was German, and France had its missionary heroes. Public opinion might be linked to Social Darwinism, the sentiment that European countries had a duty to improve the lot of backward peoples. Candidates can also discuss the importance of economic and political factors. Economic issues might include the idea that surplus capital needed areas for investment, the need for raw materials, and the stimulus to find other markets away from increasingly protectionist Europe. However, good candidates might argue that much imperial activity was centred on regions that delivered few economic advantages, especially Africa. Political factors might include the perceived need to secure national interests by keeping up with, or ahead of, other countries. Examples might include Franco-British rivalry in north Africa, for example Fashoda, German activity in south-east and south-west Africa, and rival claims in south-east Asia and China. To Britain, colonies were a continued necessity of its world role. France saw empire as evidence of recovery after the 1870 defeat by Germany. Germany, especially under William II, embarked on a policy of *Weltpolitik*. Examiners will look for adequate examples to support claims but this Question on public opinion might give more opportunity to include European examples, as long as there are some overseas references to support claims.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2009	9697	01

6 How far had Lenin overcome the problems facing the Bolshevik government of Russia by the time of his death in 1924?

The key issue is Lenin's success as the leader of Russia to 1924. Bolshevik government began in October 1917 and discussions of preceding periods will not be relevant unless included as a brief introduction. A major problem was the war with Germany. Lenin made the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk with sufficient realism to recognise that peace necessitated the surrender of large swathes of Russian territory. There were also internal enemies. The Bolsheviks/Reds were soon engaged in a civil war with the Whites. Although they were uncoordinated, the White armies posed a major threat. There was not only a danger to the central Bolshevik government but also to the integrity of the state as the war was fought from the Baltic to the east. More died in the civil war than in the war against Germany. The problem was solved, and candidates might note the contribution of Trotsky to the Bolsheviks' victory, but at a heavy price. The economy was in chaos. Industry collapsed, rural areas were unproductive, towns suffered hardship, and the communications system had collapsed. War Communism was initially seen as the answer, not only to fight the civil war, but also to exert the authority of the Bolsheviks over parts of Russia that were not involved in the war. Goods and produce were requisitioned. However, the policy failed. The system was inherently inefficient and the government was foiled by workers and peasants who had no incentive to produce surpluses. A more moderate, even partially capitalist, New Economic Policy (NEP), was introduced and achieved more success. However, this should not be exaggerated. Some of the improvement was due to naturally better harvests whilst a conservative peasantry were still suspicious of the government. A Five-Year Plan had some success in reviving industry. Politically, Lenin succeeded in suppressing other parties. The Bolsheviks seized a monopoly of power. The Cheka police system was ruthless. Lenin's use of Terror should not be underestimated. He remained foremost in the party and in power until late in his life. Surviving an assassination attempt and suffering a stroke in 1922, Lenin's personal role in 1923–24 is not absolutely clear but he did not face major challenges to his authority.

7 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Mussolini as leader of Italy in domestic affairs from 1922 to 1939.

The key issue is the assessment of Mussolini's handling of domestic affairs. Therefore, foreign policy will not be relevant and cannot be given credit. Reference might be made to the force of his personality, which was important in bringing him to power and sustaining him to 1939. He appreciated the effects of propaganda, for example in speeches, rallies, photographs, radio and films. He also saw the value of populist policies. He appeared to support workers' interests by increasing employment and by advocating a socialist programme. In practice, he was careful to remain on good terms with big business and large landowners. He was sufficiently strong to impose a one-party government on Italy by a combination of persuasion and violence, for example in the murder of Matteotti. Control was also asserted over local government through the nomination of fascist or friendly local officials. He was realistic not to challenge popular institutions. He remained friendly towards the monarchy and the Lateran Treaties (1929) reconciled his government to the Papacy. This showed the ability to be realistic. On the other hand, he lacked clear ideas; his version of fascism was very pragmatic and sometimes contradictory. The success of his economic policies and the 'corporate state' can be exaggerated. Some of the 'battles', for example the battle for grain, might well have weakened prosperity because it discriminated against other, more valuable products. Claims that the railways ran on time depended on a very narrow view. Inflation continued and the cost of living hit the poor hard. Whilst propaganda helped to keep Mussolini in power, it also concealed continuing and real problems.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2009	9697	01

8 Explain which had the greater political effects on Europe by 1850: the French Revolution or the Industrial Revolution.

The key issue is the comparative effects of the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution on Europe by the mid-nineteenth century. Candidates need to pay regard to the end-date. Although it can be argued that many of the results of the Industrial Revolution were most apparent in the second half of the nineteenth century whilst the French Revolution also continued to have consequences for Europe after 1850, this will not be relevant unless the point is made briefly in a conclusion. 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. 70:30 might lead to the award of one Band lower than would otherwise be awarded but, as always, the priority in assessment will be the quality of the argument. Band 5 will require an adequate knowledge and understanding of one of the French Revolution and Industrial Revolution. The Question is about consequences and candidates should avoid narratives of developments except when these are directly linked to effects. The French Revolution gave rise to ideas such as the rights of man that fed into liberalism and nationalism. Examples can be taken from Italy and Germany. It challenged absolute monarchy. This had effects in France but it can be argued that the Austrian monarchy survived and that the Prussian monarchy, in spite of granting a constitution at the end of the period, enjoyed considerable powers. Britain's monarchy was weaker but for reasons that did not arise from the French Revolution. The French Revolution resulted in the rise to political power of the middle classes; this continued in France but not in Austria and Germany. (Candidates are not expected to have knowledge of early nineteenth-century Russia but appropriate discussions will be given credit.) The Industrial Revolution saw the rise of an urban and industrial middle class which was to have effects in Britain and Germany by the middle of the nineteenth century. However, the limited extent of industrialisation in Italy and Austria meant that that this did not happen there. There is evidence of greater political activity among the urban working classes and socialism was developing as a political idea at the end of the period. Britain saw the demands for the franchise (unfulfilled by 1850), whilst France's urban lower classes were important in risings and revolutions. Germany, although becoming industrialised, had less political activity from this quarter.