

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the November 2004 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 November 2004 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced Level syllabuses.



Grade thresholds taken for Syllabus 9697 (History) in the November 2004 examination.

	maximum mark available	minimum mark required for grade:		
		A	B	E
Component 1	100	73	67	44

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.



November 2004

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
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2004	9697	1

GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Examiners should note the changes in the mark bands from those used in previous examinations. These changes will make it neither easier nor more difficult for candidates to reach a particular grade boundary but should facilitate decisions about grade boundaries by widening the range of marks awarded to each grade. Examiners can note the grade boundaries given below.

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 three marks, Examiners will normally award the middle mark, moderating it up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer. In bands of two 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. 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 had 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.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2004	9697	1

- 6 8–10 Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries which 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 which 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
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2004	9697	1

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

Paper 1 Marking Notes

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

1 Source-Based Question

‘Politicians were forced to declare war in 1914 because of the pressure of public opinion.’ Use Sources A–E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.

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

These answers write about the outbreak of war 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 ‘the pressure of public opinion’.* 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, ‘Politicians only declared war in 1914 because of the pressure of public opinion. Source A shows that Serbian opinion was very hostile to Austria-Hungary and called for a war. In Source B, the Kaiser refers to the importance of public opinion in Russia. Source C points out the groups in Germany that were in favour of war and Source D explains the enthusiastic feeling in London when war was declared.’

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 politicians were forced to declare war in 1914 because of the pressure of public opinion [L2, then]. On the other hand, some sources show that the politicians were not actually forced to go to war because of public opinion. In Source B, William II shows that he was very anxious about the effects of public opinion. He thought that he and Nicholas II, the Tsar of Russia, should try to calm the pro-war feelings in their countries. However, both he and Nicholas II had considerable power to control public opinion. Source C also refers to the groups in Germany that were anti-war and Source D denies that there was a war party in Britain.’

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2004	9697	1

- 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 politicians were forced into war because of the pressure of public opinion. Although an important Austro-Hungarian minister wrote Source A, his claim that Serbians were very hostile is true. The Serbian press was strongly anti-Austrian. Source B is a personal telegram from the Kaiser to Tsar Nicholas II and, although he expresses his hostility to Serbia, one can believe that he wished to avoid war with Russia at that point. The value of Source C can be doubted because a French diplomat wrote it but it is useful because it shows an awareness of the different groups in Germany. Those who supported war were much more important than those who were anti-war, who lacked leadership. Source E might be criticised as an emotional description by a British newspaper when war had just been declared but there is no reason to doubt the details of the events that are described.'

- 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 conformation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example, (L4 plus) '...However, some sources do show that war did not only break out because of public opinion. Whilst Source A shows the force of public opinion, it must be treated with care because of the wish of the Austro-Hungarian government to crush Serbia and therefore use any excuse to discredit its government. In Source B, William II claimed to be friendly towards Russia and stated his wish to restrain Austria-Hungary. However, this is contradicted by his actual policies because he did little to reconcile Austria-Hungary and Russia and to curb public opinion in Germany. As Source C states, opinion in Germany was divided but the politicians sided with those who wanted war so that the anti-war groups were given insufficient support. Source D might be dismissed as the propaganda of a British newspaper but this had little effect on British politicians when war broke out and the fact that it was written only one day before Source E shows how quickly public opinion changed.'

- 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 politicians declared war because of public opinion, the weight of the evidence is that they used this public opinion C, D and E, and were not directed by it. Only Britain and France, represented in Sources C, D and E, were democracies in which governments had to fear public opinion. The writer of Source A was a minister in an authoritarian government and his view of public opinion in Serbia is unreliable. The Kaiser's telegram to Nicholas II refers to public opinion but William II

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2004	9697	1

himself did not feel himself bound by the views of the German population. He also misinterprets the situation in Russia, an autocratic regime ruled by a Tsar who usually ignored public opinion.'

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 politicians used public opinion as an excuse to justify their policies. They had to take it into account but were not forced to declare war for that reason. Although the claim in Source A that the Serbian public was hostile to Austria-Hungary is true, the extract ignores the hostility to Serbia within Austria-Hungary and is very one-sided. In Source B, William II used public opinion to justify his policies but the tone of the telegram is misleading because the Kaiser did not try, as he claimed, to stem 'the tide of public opinion'. The report by the French Ministry in Source C concentrates on the situation in Germany but, although an official statement, it is not convincing about the desire of the French government to avoid war and does not indicate the state of public opinion in France. Sources D and E show how changeable public opinion was. They do not refer directly to British politicians but the claim in Source D that there was 'no war party' in Britain is mostly true and the politicians went to war without reference to public opinion.'

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2004	9697	1

SECTION B: ESSAY QUESTIONS

2 How far, and why, did the aims of the revolutionaries in France change during the period from 1789 to 1793?

The key issue is the extent of change in the aims of the French revolutionaries from 1789. Answers in the 22–25 band will show a clear understanding of developments in this period. They will focus on analysis and explanation and come to clear judgements about the extent of change. The answers in the 19–21 band will also be analytical and explanatory but they will miss some possible lines of discussion. There will be much descriptive narrative in answers in the 16–18 band but they will make a number of salient points of explanation about the aims of the revolutionaries. Alternatively, there might be some sound, but very partial, analyses in this band. Different levels of description narrative can merit either the 11–13 or the 14–15 band. A characteristic of the weaker answers is that they effectively stop on 1789, describing the background to the events of that year but showing an insufficient knowledge and understanding of developments to 1793. Some vague descriptions of the ancien regime that do not get beyond 1789 will not be worth 11 marks but analyses of the aims of 1789 alone might be worth 11–13 marks. Analyses of 1789 with some awareness of the main developments to 1793 might be worth 14–15 marks. The better answers will explain the move from comparatively moderate reform to hard-line republicanism. The primary aims of the revolutionaries of 1789 were economic and social reforms, especially in the fiscal system. They saw the King as their ally. In ensuing years, their targets changed. Criticism of the Church became more extreme and the revolutionaries were intolerant of those who opposed them, such as emigres and royalist provinces. Louis XVI's suspected dealings with foreign powers and the fear of defeat in the war led to his rejection. The advent of the Jacobins and their victory over more moderate groups, in conjunction with the King's own actions such as the Flight to Varennes, led to his execution. Some candidates might deserve credit for explaining the wider programme of the Jacobins in their attempts to introduce thorough change to France. Answers can either end with the execution of Louis XVI or the rule of the Jacobins.

3 How true is the claim that the most important political effect of industrialisation in the nineteenth century was to encourage the demand for democracy? (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is the political effects of nineteenth-century industrialisation. The question clearly excludes discussion of the causes of industrialisation; these will be irrelevant unless included as a brief introduction. The question points candidates towards a growth of democracy but they can suggest alternatives. For example, it can be argued that the traditional ruling classes retained much of their influence in Europe and the new wealthy middle classes had a limited view of democracy. However, most candidates are likely to agree with the claim in the question. Industrialisation created a new urban lower class that sought an extension of the franchise in Britain and France, then in the newly united Germany. This caused tensions and the ruling orders sometimes tried to buy them off by concessions in other areas, such as social reform, or by repression. In Britain, there was Chartist pressure in the middle of the century; the earlier protests were social and economic rather than demands for democracy. Almost all workingmen had the vote by the end of the century. In France, the protests of the urban poor played an important part from the 1830s but they gained little until the Third Republic. In Germany, the rural Junkers and their urban equivalents resisted democracy and the lower urban classes gained little from unification in 1871. Bismarck sought to suppress

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2004	9697	1

socialism. Answers must contain references to at least two of Britain, France and Germany but the question does not require any sort of balance. However, as a guide, most answers in the 22–25 band will usually be reasonably balanced. Very unbalanced answers might normally deserve a ceiling of 19–21 marks. General accounts with passing references to the countries might be worth no more than 15 marks but some good, if general analyses, might be worth 16–18 marks. Answers in the 11–13 band will usually contain bare descriptions, perhaps with some irrelevance. Fuller but unspecific descriptions might deserve 14–15 marks.

4 How consistent were Bismarck's aims and methods from 1862 to 1871?

The key issue is the extent of Bismarck's consistency. Answers in the 11–13 band will probably only provide relevant but limited narratives. They will assert consistency (usually) but the argument will be implicit at most. Fuller narratives with the same implicit approach will probably be worth 14–15 marks. There will be little attention to Bismarck's aims and methods as such. More explanation of his aims and methods, but still linked to a very one-sided argument, can be awarded 16–18 marks. The approach in answers in the 19–21 band will be analytical and explanatory but these answers will probably not consider as fully as they could an alternative explanation. Answers in the 21–25 band will provide this consideration of alternatives but they will come to a well-argued conclusion. The 'consistent' line is that Bismarck always sought German unification and that his methods – especially his willingness to use war – did not change. The wars against Denmark (1864), Austria (1866) and France (1870) were simply consequential stages in the same story. A broader argument about 'consistency' that might be more convincing is Bismarck's defence of Prussian interests rather than his pursuit of unification. The 'inconsistency', although offered less frequently, is that he was only an opportunist who took brilliant advantage of events that were often outside his control. The most successful answers should consider how far his aims changed after 1866. Did he wish to stop after creating the North German Confederation and destroying Austria's influence in Germany? Opportunism was an element that might be considered. For example, he could not predict Napoleon III's mistakes. His methods went beyond fighting wars; diplomacy played an important part. Candidates are very unlikely to know much about pressures on Bismarck within Prussia apart from the Budget quarrel with the Liberals. These are not usually discussed in the textbooks that candidates are likely to have read and their omission should not be regarded as a weakness in any band.

5 Assess the effects of imperial expansion on Europe in the later nineteenth century.

The key issue is the effects on Europe of imperialism. The question does not ask about its causes but candidates can link these to effects. For example, one effect was to increase rivalry between the major powers as they struggled to secure a hold in overseas territories. The most successful answers will be analytical and will consider such issues as the growth on overseas trade, the larger volume of raw materials that were available, enhanced political and strategic influence. Examiners will look for examples; a characteristic of weaker answers is that they will be very vague about specific developments. However, the geographical range of possible examples is very wide and candidates can be very selective. Relevant but broad descriptions can be awarded 11–13 marks. Fuller descriptions that lack examples can be awarded 14–15 marks. The answers in the 16–18 band will make some pertinent points of explanation or analysis, supported by some examples. The analysis will be more deliberate in answers awarded 19–21 marks although answers

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2004	9697	1

in this band will be somewhat uneven. Answers can be awarded 22–25 marks when they show a good, but not necessarily complete, range of understanding, an analytical approach and appropriate supporting knowledge.

6 How far did Nicholas II personally cause the downfall of the tsarist government in 1917?

The key issue is the assessment of Nicholas II's personal responsibility. Candidates can, and should, consider other causes of the Russian Revolution and they can argue that these were more important but the role of the Tsar should be explained at least basically to merit 11–13 marks. From 1894, Nicholas II intended to preserve his autocratic rule in Russia. The concessions that were granted after the 1905 Revolution were given reluctantly and were not fully implemented. His character was weak and he was open to the influence of reactionaries at court and his wife, Alexandra. He failed to back fully reformers such as Stolypin and Witte. His decision to take charge of the war effort was disastrous because he was blamed personally for the defeats and he was away from Moscow when the troubles of 1917 erupted. However, there were other factors. The Russian economy was backward in spite of the advances that were made. The revolutionaries were a minority but well organised. Nicholas II was a poor war leader but he was not directly responsible for the condition of the army or for the lack of communications that impeded the war effort. Answers in the 11–13 band will probably be limited to general descriptions or narratives. Fuller descriptions can be awarded 14–15 marks. Answers in these bands will contain little assessment. Some considered assessment in otherwise sound descriptions can be awarded 16–18 marks. Answers that focus on assessment of Nicholas II and compare him with some other factors can be awarded 19–21 marks but these answers will miss some possible lines of discussion. More complete assessments that are well organised and come to clear conclusions should be awarded 22–25 marks.

7 Why was Hitler able to establish dictatorial rule in Germany in the 1930s?

The key issue is the reasons for Hitler's dictatorial rule. The focus of answers should be on domestic issues. Foreign policy can be referred to briefly to show how it helped to make Hitler popular but it is not a necessary part of the answer and should not form a major element in the essays. Hitler and the Nazis gained power democratically but candidates should examine the importance of the Enabling Act because of the alleged danger to public order from the Communists, using the Reichstag Fire as justification. Although a dictator, he espoused populist policies that contrasted with the weak governments of the Weimar Republic. Measures were introduced that seemed to appeal to most sections of the population; their origin in the dictatorial rule of Hitler became less important. Appropriate measures were thought necessary in order to restore the economy. The opponents of the regime were forced to capitulate. The use of the Gestapo suppressed real and imagined enemies of the state. He won the co-operation of the army, partly by crushing the SA in the Night of the Long Knives. Propaganda was important in portraying Hitler in a favourable light. Answers worth 11–13 marks will probably contain generally relevant descriptions of Nazi Germany. The specific issue of Hitler's dictatorial rule might be implicit rather than explicit. 14–15 marks can be awarded for fuller descriptions. The focus on Hitler will be dearer in the answers worth 16–18 marks although the approach will still be largely descriptive. 19–21 answers will emphasise analysis but will miss some possible lines of discussion. Fuller analyses and clear judgements, supported by sound knowledge, can be awarded 22–25 marks.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2004	9697	1

8 Why, by 1900, was Russia less industrialised than Britain and Germany?

The key issue is the comparison of the state of industrialisation in Russia and Britain and Germany. Answers should be reasonably balanced between the two elements. 60: 40 either way can deserve any mark band whilst 70:30 will usually result in the award of one band lower than would otherwise be given. 11–13 marks will require a basic knowledge and understanding of one of the elements. However, Examiners will not require a balance between Britain and Germany. The important factor is that candidates can see these as examples of comparatively highly industrialised countries. Russia lacked an investment base, with a small middle class and a nobility that was dependent on land and regarded industry as beneath their notice. Britain and Germany had such investing classes. Russia was ruled by an autocracy that governed the economy narrowly whereas Britain and Germany, although governed in different ways from each other, allowed more freedom to entrepreneurs. The tsars had attempted various economic reforms to a highly agricultural system but political and social tradition and the heavy hand of serfdom prevented radical changes. There were opposing attitudes in Russia to real economic change; some feared that it would unleash social unrest and revolutionaries. High credit should be given when answers point out the advances that had been made in Russian industry by 1900. 11–13 marks will usually be appropriate for general accounts of the Russian economy with some reference to Britain and Germany. The comparative element will be very limited. Fuller descriptions can be given 14–15 marks. There will be some clear comparison in the 16–18 answers although the quality of the comparison will be very uneven. For example, it might be limited to an introduction and conclusion in mostly sequential essays. Answers in the 19–21 band should focus on comparison but these answers will contain some gaps. Fuller comparisons supported by appropriate knowledge can be awarded 22–25 marks.