

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the June 2005 question paper

9697 HISTORY

**9697/01 Paper 1 (Modern European History, 1789-1939),
maximum mark 100**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. It does 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 discussion or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2005 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Grade thresholds for Syllabus 9697 (History) in the June 2005 examination.

	maximum mark available	minimum mark required for grade:		
		A	B	E
Component 1	100	72	66	43

The thresholds (minimum marks) for Grades C and D are normally set by dividing the mark range between the B and the E thresholds into three. For example, if the difference between the B and the E threshold is 24 marks, the C threshold is set 8 marks below the B threshold and the D threshold is set another 8 marks down. If dividing the interval by three results in a fraction of a mark, then the threshold is normally rounded down.



June 2005

GCE AS/A LEVEL

MARK SCHEME

MAXIMUM MARK: 100

SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 9697/01

HISTORY

Paper 1 (Modern European History, 1789-1939)

Page 1	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL– JUNE 2005	9697	1

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 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.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL– JUNE 2005	9697	1

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– JUNE 2005	9697	1

Section A The origins of World War I, 1870-1914

1 Source-Based Question

L1 Writes about the hypothesis, no use of sources [1-5]

These answers write generally about the causes of 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 '*Russia's policies caused the outbreak of war in 1914*' 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: 'Russia's policies caused the outbreak of war in 1914. Source A says that Russia supported Serbia and would defend it, that is wage war, if attempts to reach a settlement failed. Source C shows that Germany was critical of Russia's support for Serbia and that Russian mobilisation sparked off the war. On the other hand, Germany had tried to restrain Austria-Hungary and had made an effort to settle the differences between Austria-Hungary and Russia, Source D is very critical of Russian policies. Russia had tried to extend its influence and power for a long time.

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 disconfirm it. However, sources are used only at face value.

For example: 'There is evidence for and against the claim that Russia's policies caused an outbreak of war in 1914. Evidence for the claim is that Source C states that Germany had pursued friendly policies towards Russia and that Russia had backed Serbia's unreasonable attitude. Germany was trying to restrain Austria-Hungary but Russia mobilised its army, destabilising the situation. Source D supports this claim in a lengthy statement by the Austro-Hungarian government, which clearly puts the blame for the outbreak of war on Russia. In the long term, Russia pursued expansionist policies whilst, in the short term, Russian mobilisation made war inevitable. Evidence against the claim is provided in Sources A and B. Source A emphasises the Tsar's wish to avoid war. Nicholas II reassures Kaiser William II that he was anxious to resolve problems between Russia and Germany. Source B blames Germany for forcing Russia to mobilise and for declaring war when negotiations were still continuing. The sources are equally balanced between support for, and challenge to, the hypothesis; two agree and two disagree.

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 Russia's policies did not cause the outbreak of war in 1914. Source A shows how Nicholas II personally intervened to try to persuade a leading figure in Serbia to settle the problem and there is no need to

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL– JUNE 2005	9697	1

deny the reliability of this telegram. Although Source B concedes that Russia did mobilise, it is correct in pointing out that German policies were aggressive. Zimmermann's statement in Source C that Germany was always friendly towards Serbia should be doubted because Germany gave its full support to Austria-Hungary, including the 'blank cheque'. Source D can be dismissed as propaganda by the Austro-Hungarian government to justify its actions against Serbia.'

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 confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example: (L4 plus) '...However, the sources can also be interpreted to show that Russian policies did cause war to break out. Source B was intended to justify Russian policy and it underestimates the effect of Russian mobilisation. This put considerable pressure on Austria-Hungary and Germany. The importance of this factor is underlined in Source C, which appears to be a reliable account of the Serbian ambassador's conversation with Zimmermann. However, one cannot be certain that Zimmermann was reflecting fully the attitude of the German government. In spite of its extreme language, Source D demonstrates clearly Austria-Hungary's fears of Russia. The crisis in 1914 had a long background of Russian wishes for expansionism through the Balkans and elsewhere.

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 Russian policies did cause war to break out. Source B was intended to justify Russian policy and it underestimates the effect of Russian mobilisation. This put considerable pressure on Austria-Hungary and Germany. The importance of this factor is underlined in Source C, which appears to be a reliable account of the Serbian ambassador's conversation with Zimmermann. However, one cannot be certain that Zimmermann was reflecting fully the attitude of the German government. In spite of its extreme language, Source D demonstrates clearly Austria-Hungary's fears of Russia. The crisis in 1914 had a long background of Russian wishes for expansionism through the Balkans and elsewhere in the Middle East.'

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL– JUNE 2005	9697	1

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 Russia's policies caused the outbreak of war in 1914, the most convincing case contradicts the claim. The most persuasive evidence is in Source A, which shows the personal intervention of the Tsar. Source B is also correct to point out that Austria-Hungary did not negotiate seriously to resolve the problem but was intent on attacking and defeating Serbia. Germany gave its support unnecessarily to Austria-Hungary. In Source C, Zimmermann is wrong when he claims that Germany had tried to persuade Austria-Hungary to reach a settlement. The unreliability of Source D is clear not only from its language but also from some of its claims. For example, Austria-Hungary was very hostile to Serbia.'

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 should be shared and especially between Russia and Germany. Source A shows that Nicholas II did not press Serbia hard enough to reach a settlement; if negotiations broke down, Russia would still support Serbia. Source D indicates Austro-Hungarian fears of Russia but they were not unreasonable in view of the developments of the previous fifty years. Germany intervened in a quarrel between Russia, Austria-Hungary and Serbia in which it was not directly involved and declared war when negotiations were still being conducted. Zimmermann would obviously defend German policies but his claims in Source C that Germany tried to restrain Austria-Hungary are not credible. Source D does not point directly to Germany's responsibility but it confirms Austria-Hungary's determination and therefore Germany's mistake in giving its full support to that state. Although a very biased source, it does contain a series of valid points and the dangerous effects of Russian policy over a prolonged period and should not be dismissed completely.'

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL– JUNE 2005	9697	1

Section B

2 How far was Napoleon Bonaparte an oppressive ruler in his domestic policies from 1799 to 1815?

The key issue is the assessment of Napoleon's domestic policies. Foreign policy will be irrelevant unless mentioned briefly in an introduction or conclusion. For the highest marks, 21 – 25, Examiners will expect answers to consider the case for and against the claim that he was oppressive, coming to a clear conclusion.

For 11-13 marks, answers should be expected to demonstrate a basic knowledge and understanding of the main elements of domestic policies. Some policies might be seen by some as oppressive and by others as liberating. 1799 marks the appointment of Napoleon as First Consul after the fall of the Directory. Especially during the Consulate, he implemented many reforms such as the Code Napoleon and the Concordat (1801). The former helped to restore administrative order to France and guaranteed certain rights but it also strengthened Napoleon's authority. The latter was a reconciliation between France and the Papacy/Roman Catholic Church. This pleased many French people who retained their religious views but it afforded Napoleon a considerable measure of control over the Church. The Empire (1804) saw Napoleon achieve even more power and he was dominant over every aspect of French life. Candidates can explain administrative measures that cemented the authority or oppression of the Emperor. Officials were nominated rather than freely elected. The most successful candidates should be able to note and assess the reasons for the continuing opposition to Napoleon within France which was controlled to some extent by a harsh police system.

Answers worth 11-13 marks should display basically acceptable knowledge but there will be little considered assessment. 14-15 marks can be awarded to answers that are relevant and more detailed but still more dependent on narrative and description than assessment and comparison. 16-17 marks might be awarded to answers that contain more analysis and assessment but where the assessment might be largely implicit. 18-20 marks will be appropriate for answers that focus on the key issue but in which there is evident imbalance and unevenness. The discriminating factor in the 21-25 mark answers might well be their success in providing convincing assessments.

3 Discuss the claim that the middle classes gained most from the Industrial Revolution in Europe.

Most candidates will probably agree with the claim but the most successful answers will explain why the middle classes so benefited. This might only be asserted in less successful answers. The middle classes found an outlet for investment and industrialisation proved profitable. Industrialisation meant comparative freedom from the limitations of traditional societies and economies that were dominated by land and the landed aristocracy. In turn, this allowed the middle classes to play a more important political role. Examples of this might be drawn from Germany or France or Britain. Most candidates who discuss the working classes will probably argue that they did not benefit; there is a tendency to romanticise the appeal of rural life that many of them left for the industrialised cities. But high credit should be given when answers note that, in spite of the squalor, there were improvements in (usually) more secure employment and often a higher standard of living, although this was comparative. The temptation will be for some candidates to describe the processes of industrialisation without considering their effects. Examiners should read such answers particularly carefully to see if the candidates are making valid points implicitly. Such answers might be only moderate in quality, perhaps worth 11-13 and at the most 14-15 marks, but they should not automatically be consigned to a very low mark. On the other hand, the question is not about the causes of the Industrial Revolution and a very heavy emphasis on this aspect cannot be awarded 11-13 marks. 16-17 marks might be appropriate for answers that contain description but where there are clear links to some

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL– JUNE 2005	9697	1

social effects. 18-20 marks will require more specific treatments although there will be some unevenness. The analysis of the key issue will be clear in answers worth 21-25 marks and the supporting examples or knowledge will be appropriate.

4 Explain the growing support for nationalism in Germany and Italy from 1848 to 1871.

The key issue is the reason for the growth of nationalism within the specified period from the 1848 revolutions to the establishment of the new German Empire and Italian Kingdom. Candidates can explain the background from 1815 but this will not be necessary for any mark band. At most, such material should only be used as an extensive introduction. Most candidates will probably deal with Germany and Italy separately but high credit should be given to those who attempt a more integrated argument. This is not to exclude answers from the 21-25 band if they take the former line but this band will still need a view of some common (or different) features either in an extended introduction or conclusion. Examiners will look for a reasonable balance between the two regions. 60:40 either way will be acceptable. 70:30 would normally lead to the award of one band lower than would otherwise be given.

For 11-13 marks, answers should be expected to demonstrate a basic knowledge and understanding of either Germany or Italy. Answers might consider the importance of the 1848-9 revolutions which, although failures in Germany and Italy, provided an inspiration to those who wished for the unification of Germany and Italy. Failure exposed the weaknesses of nationalist forces at that point and provided a lesson. The failures of 1848-49 did not discredit nationalism as a force. In Germany, it highlighted the importance of Prussia within Germany whilst realistic Italians such as Cavour saw the need for foreign assistance to defeat Austria. In Germany, nationalism had an economic appeal, for example through the Zollverein. Bismarck might not have been a German nationalist, rather a champion of Prussian interests, but he harnessed nationalism to achieve his aims. In Italy, although Mazzini, the ultra-nationalist, did not achieve his aims of a united Italian republic, Cavour was forced to recognise nationalism as a force especially as represented by Garibaldi. Some perceptive candidates might note that regionalism rather than nationalism was an important force in much of this period and high credit should be given when candidates discuss how far Bismarck and Cavour were German and Italian nationalists rather than champions of Prussia and Piedmont. To reach 11-13 marks, the answers should show a basic knowledge and understanding of the development of nationalism in at least one of the two specified countries but the narrative will probably clearly outweigh the explanation.

Fuller information will be needed for 14-15 marks but the argument will still be mostly implicit. In the 16-17 band, there should be a clear attempt to explain some salient aspects of the key issue and they will achieve a genuine argument although the narrative element might be provided separately. 18-20 marks can be awarded to answers that are uneven but which contain more valid explanation than narrative. 21-25 marks might be given to answers that are well organised and coherent in their arguments, with appropriate factual material.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL– JUNE 2005	9697	1

5 Why were European governments more willing to support imperialist policies in the later years of the nineteenth century? (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is governments' support for imperialism. The question asks 'Why...?' and the answers in the 18-20 and 21-25 bands should focus on analysis. The requirement to discuss at least two countries is to dissuade candidates from writing vague accounts. Credit should be given when answers provide overseas examples; a tendency in answers that merit only the middle or lower mark bands might be to make general, if valid, assertions that are insufficiently supported by factual material. Governments took more interest in overseas expansion partly because of the fear that others would take a lead; international competition increased during these years. For example, Britain and France were rivals in parts of Africa. Empires were seen as a barometer of national power. The new Germany sought increased influence overseas in spite of the misgivings of Bismarck. The French Third Republic saw Empire as a means to restore the greatness of the country that had been humiliated in 1870. There was the promise of increased trade and the supply of raw materials for industry. Governments came under pressure from their populations and the media/newspapers and, to some extent, were committed by the actions of individuals such as Rhodes in South Africa.

In the 11-13 band, the answers will probably contain relevant but general descriptions. There might be few specific examples. 14-15 marks can be awarded to answers that are more detailed in their description. Although the quality of the explanation will still be limited in the 16-17 answers, it should be clearer and the candidates will achieve a genuine, if limited, argument. The combination of argument and appropriate examples should take answers into the 18-20 band whilst the 21-25 answers will be consistently analytical, varied in their arguments and well supported factually.

6 How far had Lenin achieved his aims by the time of his death in 1924?

The key issue is the achievements of Lenin. It will be appropriate to examine Lenin's aims but candidates should not spend too much time on developments before 1917. He had obviously not achieved his aims before the Revolution. The most successful answers should consider both his successes and his failures and come to a considered balance of judgement. Answers in the middle and lower bands might focus exclusively on successes. In 1917, Lenin took the Bolsheviks to power. He then led the new government to victory against the Whites in the civil war. The war with Germany was ended. He established a one-party state and he was unchallenged personally. On the other hand, the war was ended at a terrible cost to Russia. Lenin's economic measures, especially War Communism, almost led to collapse and had to be revised in the New Economic Policy. Survival was achieved at the cost of abandoning Marxist-communist principles. However, there is evidence of a return to his earlier policies just before his death. 11-13 marks can be awarded to answers that show a sufficient knowledge of Lenin's policies from 1917 to 1924. These will probably be presented in a highly descriptive or narrative manner with little attention to assessment. 14-15 marks can be awarded to fuller descriptions.

A problem might be the answers that deal only with 1917. This should normally be limited to a ceiling of 15 marks, however well done, because they will ignore important aspects of the key issue. 16-17 marks can be awarded to answers that contain some clear analysis or explanation/assessment but where the emphasis might still be on description. 18-20 answers will be focused on assessment but there might be some clear unevenness although some major aspects will be considered. More consistent and thorough analysis and assessment can lead answers to the 21-25 band.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL– JUNE 2005	9697	1

- 7 How accurate is the claim that the effects of World War I were the most important reason for the rise of totalitarian governments in Europe during the period to 1939? (You should refer to at least two of Germany, Italy and Russia in your answer.)**

The key issue is the causes of the rise of totalitarian governments and especially the assessment of the effects of World War I. The mark will not depend on whether candidates refer to two or three of the specified countries but a mark of 11-13 will require an adequate discussion of at least one. 21-25 answers should be reasonably balanced between two countries; a slight weakness in the third, if this is attempted, will be allowable. The war had serious political and economic effects. It destabilised an authoritarian regime in Russia and the post-war democratic governments in Germany and Italy because neither state was content with the outcome of the conflict. Economic consequences were clear. The immediate impact of the war was severe. Germany had to pay particularly heavy reparations. (High credit should be given to the answers that consider the economic losses to Russia that followed from the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk). In Germany and Italy, the war led to the growing appeal of ultra-nationalist groups whilst it confirmed communist leader, Lenin and then Stalin, in power in Russia. With this basis, candidates can explore other factors in the rise of totalitarian governments, such as the personal appeal of leaders and their use both of propaganda and terror to enforce obedience. Perhaps some might mention the willingness of democratic forces to accept Hitler and Mussolini as leaders of their country before their excesses were evident.

The weight to be given to the effects of World War I will depend on candidates' arguments but most will probably agree with the claim and thus give more time to assessments of the war. Answers in the 11-13 band will probably be very descriptive and/or narrative but answers in the 14-15 band should provide more explanation, though this will still probably be subordinate. In the 16-17 band, the answers should show a clear understanding of the salient issues posed by the question and will contain mostly clear arguments but there will still be a reliance on description. The emphasis on explanation will characterise answers in the 18-20 band and answers should be structured coherently. The 21-25 mark answers should be consistently explanatory and the supporting factual material should be appropriate. However, Examiners are reminded of the need to deal with at least two countries and will adjust their expectations of detail accordingly.

- 8 Examine the claim that Marxism developed to 1914 as the result of industrialisation.**

The key issue is the link between Marxism and industrialisation. The instruction to refer to at least two countries is to dissuade candidates from writing vague accounts. Marxism emphasised the importance of economic forces and highlighted the class struggle. The 'Communist Manifesto' (1848) proclaimed the necessity for social revolution. It was linked to industrialisation because he held that capitalist industrial states suppressed the wage earners/proletariat. The middle class/bourgeoisie were said to use industrialisation to exploit the lower classes. The 'evils' of industrialisation both required and justified Marxist solutions. The ideas appealed most to those in industrial societies, especially in France and Germany. Perhaps ironically, it had less appeal in highly industrialised Britain. Marxism was never more than a minority philosophy but its adherents were enthusiastic and capable of effective propaganda. The question mentions its development in the nineteenth century but Examiners should accept discussions of Russian communism at least to the 1917 Revolution. Again ironically, Russia was not an industrially-based country.

11-13 marks will require a basic understanding of Marxism; references to particular countries might be vague.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL– JUNE 2005	9697	1

General accounts of industrialisation that do not reflect the key issue will not be able to merit this mark band. 14-15 answers will still probably be dominated by studies of industrialisation but the handling of Marxism should be competent. The link might be tenuous. The link will be clearer in answers that are worth 16-17 marks. 18-20 marks might be awarded to answers that are focused on the demands of the question even if candidates' success in handling both aspects and in making a link between them is uneven. The supporting material should be mostly appropriate. 21-25 marks can be awarded to answers that are consistently explanatory and success in making a link between the two key elements. The supporting factual material should be sound.