

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2007 question paper

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.

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 May/June 2007 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2007	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 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 more 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	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2007	9697	01

Source-based question: Analysis and evaluation

Question: ‘During the period from 1896 to 1914, German leaders were determined to go to war.’ 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	Memorandum from an important German official to a leading person in the German monarchy.	Y-Support for war. N-A general economic struggle for which Germany is not responsible.	Y-The author is in a position to know German policy. He is writing to a leading monarchist and would be unlikely to try to mislead him. N-He is not an objective reporter. Although useful, the Source might not be reliable.	Y-Agrees with Sources B and D about the necessity of war. N-Disagrees with Sources C and E.	Y-Europe was in an economic struggle which threatened the balance of power. Y-From a German viewpoint, Britain’s domination was threatening. N-The fears of Britain’s ambitions for world domination and the threat to central Europe were exaggerated.
B	Diary of a German admiral.	Y-Refers to policy of the Kaiser. Support for policy of military build-up. Y-War is inevitable.	Y-The words of William II are quoted, as are the words and opinions of others. Unlikely to be a fabrication. Y-Diaries are usually written soon after events, having some reliability from this. N-It is one person’s account and this might affect its reliability.	Y-Agrees with Sources A and D about the necessity of war. N-Disagrees with Sources C and E.	Y-Germany did give full backing to Austria against Serbia. Britain and Germany were engaged in naval rivalry.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2007	9697	01

C	Private notes by the German Chancellor.	N-Denial that Germany/Kaiser was supporting war. No invasion of Britain planned.	Y-Private notes, not meant for publication, might be reliable. N-It is possible that the Chancellor and the German government were not being frank with Bavaria.	Y-Agrees with Source E. N-Disagrees with Sources A, B and D.	Y-Germany did not plan an invasion of Britain. N-Apart from this specific point, Germany's politicians saw Britain as a major enemy.
D	A book by the heir to the German Emperor.	Y-War suits Germany's interests more than peace. Military values and traditions should be supported.	Y-The book was written by an important personage who was close to the Kaiser and, by inference, to other German leaders and thinkers. N-The author might be expressing his personal opinions, not the views of other German leaders.	Y-Agrees with Sources A and B about the necessity of war. N-Disagrees with Sources C and E.	Y-The content and tone of the book are typical of many German politicians. Y-Germany relied on the strong roles of military tradition and power.
E	A speech to the German Reichstag by the Chancellor.	N-Germany is the victim of other countries' suspicions. Germany had sought peace. Russia began the war.	Y-The Chancellor was in a position of political authority. N-A political speech might well be unreliable. He was trying to persuade his audience. His task was to unify Germans not primarily to give an objective analysis.	Y-Agrees with Source C. N-Disagrees with Sources A, B and D.	Y-In a narrow sense, the source is correct because Russian mobilisation was the immediate cause of the outbreak of hostilities with Germany. N-The Source misrepresents the wider events. It is an inaccurate account of the invasion of Belgium. Relations with France are misrepresented. Policies and events that point to German war guilt are ignored.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2007	9697	01

**SECTION A: THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR I, 1870–1914
GERMAN FOREIGN POLICY BEFORE WORLD WAR 1**

1 Source-Based Question

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

These answers write generally about issues before World War I but will ignore the key issues in the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss *‘During the period from 1896 to 1914, German leaders were determined to go to war’* but might make only general points about the causes of the war. 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, *‘During the period from 1896 to 1914, German leaders were determined to go to war. Source A believes that war was inevitable because of the general economic struggle. War would end Britain’s world domination. Source B shows the military and especially the naval preparations that Germany was making for war. Austria would be supported fully against Serbia whilst propaganda through newspapers would make the war against Russia more popular. Source D welcomes war because it would be in the interests of 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, *‘There is evidence for and against the claim that ‘During the period from 1896 to 1914, German leaders were determined to go to war’. In support of the claim, Source A believes that war was inevitable because of the general economic struggle. War would end Britain’s world domination. Source B shows the military and especially the naval preparations that Germany was making for war. Austria would be supported fully against Serbia whilst propaganda through newspapers would make the war against Russia more popular. Source D welcomes war because it would be in the interests of Germany. On the other hand, Source C disproves the claim. Bethmann Hollweg reassures the Prince Regent of Bavaria that Kaiser William II did not have aggressive intentions and was not planning an invasion of Britain. Claims of warlike preparations by the German Kaiser were flatly contradicted. Source E states that Germany entered the war unwillingly. It wished for peace but was forced into war by Russia and France. It was therefore necessary for Germany to fight.’*

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2007	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, *‘It is more accurate to conclude that that during the period from 1896 to 1914, German leaders were determined to go to war. Sources A, B and D confirm this claim. Sources A and D provide a general view of German policies. Source A shows that German leaders were considering war long before it broke out in 1914. Britain was seen as the arch-enemy. Source D defends and praises German military traditions, an attitude that would make war more likely. Source B describes military preparations two years before the outbreak of war. Plans were being made to strengthen Germany’s power at sea. The use of mines and submarines were aggressive. The Source also mentions plans for war against France and Russia. The Sources are reliable because they represent the opinions of important people in Germany. Source A was written by an admiral who would know particularly the naval concerns of Germany and he was writing to an eminent German, the brother of the Kaiser. Source A is probably accurate as an account of a discussion between William II and his leading military staff. Although a personal diary, the record of the meeting is probably reliable as an account of what took place. Source D might not be reliable, as an extract from a book that was intended to persuade Germans, but it is useful as the views of a leading German.’*

L5 BY INTERPRETING AND 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 confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example, (L4 plus) *‘...However, the sources can also be interpreted to show that, during the period from 1896 to 1914, German leaders were not determined to go to war. Although Bethmann Hollweg in Source C might be trying to convince the Prince Regent of Bavaria of Germany’s peaceful intentions, the provenance of the extract, that is his private notes, are probably a reliable version of what he believed. The Source was written about two years before the beginning of World War I and might accurately represent German policy at that point. Source D is warlike but, although the Crown Prince was important, he did not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Kaiser or of other German leaders. Whilst Source E is unreliable in some respects, it records accurately some of the main developments that led to war, especially the importance of Russian mobilisation.’*

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2007	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, during the period from 1896 to 1914, German leaders were determined to go to war, the overall conclusion is that German leaders were indeed warlike. Not only do most of the Sources support this conclusion, but also other knowledge confirms this view. From at least the beginning of the twentieth century, German foreign policy took an aggressive stance. Germany was mostly responsible for the international naval race. Its policies were mostly responsible for threatening the balance of power. After the Sarajevo Crisis, Germany did little to restrain Austria-Hungary and even encouraged its extreme reaction by issuing a ‘blank cheque’ of support.’*

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 responsibility for the growing international tensions from 1896 to 1914 was shared between the leaders of several countries. Although none actively sought war, their policies and actions made the situation dangerous. For example, the alliance system saw Austria-Hungary, Germany and Italy in the Triple Alliance against Britain, France and Russia in the Triple Entente. Successive crises during this period were solved but only temporarily because the underlying hostility continued.’*

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2007	9697	01

Section B

2 Why did Louis XVI's policies from 1789 fail to prevent his execution in 1793?

The key issue is the assessment of Louis XVI's policies as a reason for his execution. The question asks 'Why...?' and examiners will award the highest marks to answers that are analytical, providing a series of reasons for the execution of Louis XVI. However, excellent answers can be organised chronologically because the period from 1789 to 1793 saw many changes that can be examined sequentially. Candidates might examine his reluctance to accept the comparatively moderate changes that were demanded by the Third Estate in 1789. He sided with the First and Second Estates until he was forced to concede. He was forced to accept the Declaration of Rights and the Civil Constitution of the clergy. Suspicions that he wanted to overturn the concessions, probably with foreign assistance, were reinforced when he fled to Varennes. Answers in Band 1 should also consider the impact of other factors that led to the King's execution. These included a worsening economic situation and the rise of political radicalism, leading eventually to the (brief) triumph of Robespierre and the Jacobins, who were directly responsible for Louis XVI's execution. War and counter-revolution in the provinces threatened the gains of the Revolution and had an impact on the King's situation. The Grand Peur, the Terror and the influence of Paris and the sans-culottes might be seen as evidence of the burgeoning influence of the urban lower classes. Some candidates might consider the reputation of the Queen, Marie Antoinette, and the royalist supporters.

3 Why were improvements in communications important to industrialisation? (You should refer to developments in *at least two* of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is the reasons why communications were important to industrialisation. Candidates should note the need to refer to two countries as examples but the question does not require extensive developments of the examples that are used. Improvements in communications during the process of industrialisation might include canals and steamships but railways will probably loom largest. Some candidates might describe the development of cars or aeroplanes but it is difficult to see how they contributed to industrialisation, even if answers are taken to 1939, the end of the option. Some candidates might concentrate on descriptions of industrialisation with little attention to communications. Such answers might be worth up to Band 4 (14–15 marks) but not more because they will not focus sufficiently on the key issue. Other answers might deal with communications at length but in a largely descriptive manner. The analysis will be implicit. These might be worth up to Band 3 (16–17 marks). One would normally expect more deliberate analysis for Bands 1 and 2. Candidates might consider that a major factor was that canals and then railways could carry large and heavy loads faster and more efficiently than previous methods of communication. They created centres of industry as cities and towns grew. Other industries were stimulated, for example iron and steel. Capital investment was encouraged. They also allowed for products to be distributed on a larger scale. Steamships opened up world markets and trade. Especially in Britain and Germany, but also later in France, the improvements in communications were directly linked to industrial growth. It will be relevant, but not necessary, to contrast the regions where communications and industrialisation improved with those that remained backward.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2007	9697	01

- 4 'The divisions among the revolutionaries were the most important reason why Austria was able to suppress the revolutions in Italy and Germany in 1848–49.' How far do you agree with this claim?**

The key issue is the reason for the failure of the revolutions of 1848–49 in Italy and Germany. Examiners will expect a reasonable balance in the discussion of the two regions for marks in Bands 1 and 2 (18–20; 21–25). 60:40 either way will be acceptable. An understanding of the revolutions in one region will be required for Band 5 (11–13). Candidates can argue that other factors were more important than divisions among the revolutionaries, for example Austrian military power, but the stated factor should normally be given some attention for Band 5. In Italy, the revolutionaries had different aims. For some, local grievances were most important. For example, Sicily resented rule by Naples. Mazzini and Garibaldi aimed at wider issues when they established the Roman Republic. Piedmont's leaders had a different agenda. In Germany, Liberals demanded constitutional reform but disagreements appeared, for example over the role of Prussia. There was no coordination between the movements. Religious divisions between Catholics and Protestants were important. Candidates might explain the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament. On the other hand, Austria's army was stronger than any force that the revolutionaries could muster. Their generals were more capable; answers might mention Radetsky in Italy.

- 5 Explain the reasons why any two European countries were involved in the 'new imperialism' of the later nineteenth century.**

The key issue is the reasons for European involvement in 'new imperialism'. Candidates are asked to base their answers on two countries; this direction is intended to avoid vague answers. An important discriminating factor when assessing answers will be the use of overseas examples. A characteristic of moderate answers is often that they rehearse motives without providing supporting examples. On the other hand, the range of possible examples is very wide and answers might well focus on particular regions, perhaps Africa or south-east Asia. Such a focus can merit any mark. Candidates might consider political reasons, for example, fear of international competition. This led to a fevered search for overseas territories to prevent them falling under the control of other countries. There were internal political pressures; imperialism became popular. Economic motives might include the search for raw materials and wider markets (an exaggerated hope). Surplus capital could be invested. There were ethical motives which some see as religious and others as Social Darwinism. A few had hopes that empire might be the solution to growing populations but few emigrated to the new territories.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2007	9697	01

6 Why did the tsarist regime in Russia survive the 1905 Revolution but not the February 1917 Revolution?

The question asks ‘Why...?’ and examiners will award the highest marks to answers that are analytical, providing a series of reasons for the different outcomes of the Revolutions. However, excellent answers can be organised chronologically because the period from 1905 to 1917 saw many changes that can be examined sequentially. Candidates should note the end point of the question. Examiners can expect a reasonable balance between 1905 and 1917 for Band I (21-25 marks). 60:40 either way can merit any mark. Band 5 (11–13) will require an adequate understanding of one Revolution. References to the October Revolution of 1917 will only be relevant if included briefly in an introduction or conclusion. Candidates might argue that the role of the army was a key difference. In 1905, its support was an important factor in the defeat of the Revolution. (But candidate might note the Potemkin naval mutiny.) By 1917, Nicholas II had lost its support as the army fell apart following the losses in World War I. Candidates might compare the dangers presented by the opposition in 1905 and 1917. 1905 saw a comparatively limited movement of protest, centred on St. Petersburg. There were other risings in towns and among the peasantry but they were uncoordinated and poorly led. The protests were not against tsarism or the Tsar as such and Nicholas II was able to win time by offering the October Manifesto. By 1917, he was not able to win time by offering concessions. The social and economic damage caused by the war was horrendous. Nicholas II had taken personal command and his own reputation as a leader suffered. Any gains made since 1905 were negated. St. Petersburg was again the centre of disturbances but they spread more widely and more violently when Nicholas II lost control.

7 How far was it the effects of World War One that brought about the rise of totalitarian regimes in inter-war Europe? (You should refer to *at least two* of Germany, Italy and Russia in your answer.)

The key issue is the rise of totalitarian regimes. Candidates are directed to refer to at least two countries. Marks will not depend on the number of countries referred to; the overall quality of the arguments will be more important. Nor will examiners look for a balance between the two, or more, countries. A strong case can be made for the importance of World War One as a cause. It destroyed the reputations of governments in each of the three countries. In Russia, the tsarist regime of Nicholas II and the more liberal government of Kerensky fell largely because of their involvement in the war. The German Weimar government was blamed for agreeing to the humiliating Versailles settlement. Italy did not receive its expected gains after the war. There were also economic effects. The war caused inflation and economic hardship. However, good candidates might point out that the economic crisis that preceded the Nazis’ period of power arose more from the Wall Street Crash than from the post-war crisis. In Band 1 (21–25) and in most of the Band 2 (18–20), answers should consider alternative explanations, such as the personal role of leaders (Hitler, Mussolini and Lenin). Nationalism was an important factor in Germany and Italy but less influential in Russia in 1917. Party organisation might be referred to; the Nazis, Fascists and Bolsheviks proved to be more adept in winning power than their opponents. This might give rise to the explanation of the term ‘totalitarian’, in comparison with liberal or democratic.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2007	9697	01

8 How similar was the German nationalism of Bismarck to that of Hitler?

The key issue is the comparison of German nationalism in two periods. Many answers might be constructed sequentially. This approach is possible but might make it difficult for answers to reach Band 1 (21–25) because it might put less emphasis on the comparative element. However, a sequential answer with strong comparative points might make this Band. There should be a reasonable balance between the two periods. 60:40 either way might merit any Band. Band 5 (11–13) will require an adequate understanding of one. Examiners should note that the component ends in 1939; candidates are not expected to show knowledge and understanding of Hitler's nationalism after that date. Candidates might argue that the differences/contrasts were more evident than the similarities. This will be a very viable approach. It is possible to argue that, at least to 1871, Bismarck was more a champion of Prussian interests than a German nationalist. From the time of Germany's unification, he was careful to preserve Prussia's interests in the constitution, government and policies. His foreign policy proved that, whilst maintaining Germany's national interests, he was careful not to appear expansionist after 1871. However, he used German nationalism effectively in the 1860s, especially to unify the northern and southern states from 1866 to 1871. It was also a factor in the Schleswig-Holstein crisis (1864). On the other hand, Hitler's nationalism became more violent; it led him to suppress minorities within Germany who were seen as non-German, such as the Jews. German nationalism was highly racial, with the advocacy of Aryan values. It permeated non-political interests, including culture. Although there were other reasons for Hitler's rise to power, his use of the weapon of German nationalism was important. Foreign policy can be used to demonstrate Hitler's use of German nationalism, for example the Anschluss with Austria and the seizure of the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia.