

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2013 series

9697 HISTORY

9697/13

Paper 13, 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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2013 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	13

GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
1	21–25	<i>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.</i>
2	18–20	<i>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.</i>
3	16–17	<i>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.</i>
4	14–15	<i>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.</i>
5	11–13	<i>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.</i>
6	8–10	<i>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.</i>
7	0–7	<i>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.</i>

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	13

Section A: Source-Based Question

‘Serbia was responsible for the crisis in the Balkans.’ 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	Official statement of the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria.	The annexation was justified in the interests of Bosnia and Herzegovina.	Y – Bosnia-Herzegovina did have a devolved administration in the Austrian empire. N – The annexation was a takeover, not an agreed settlement with Bosnia-Herzegovina. N – Claims about advantages for Bosnia-Herzegovina are not proved. N – The source is very one-sided.	N – B declares the annexation a disaster.	The Balkans background to 1914 can be examined, including the reasons why Austria carried it through and its effects on stability.
B	Announcement by a Serbian nationalist society.	The annexation denied Serbs and their allies freedom and independence. Resistance was a duty of all Serbs.	Y – Austria probably did have long-term plans to curb Serbian independence. N – The source is very intemperate and subjective.	N – A sees Austrian policy, including the annexation, as justified. N – C Germany describes the linked issues of stability in the Balkans and international peace. N – E holds Serbian ambition largely responsible for instability in the Balkans.	Candidates can explain the aims of Serbian nationalism and the extreme nationalist groups in particular.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	13

C	Statement by the German Foreign Ministry.	Serbian policies threaten peace and Austria in particular.	Y – In the short term, most countries agreed that Serbia was responsible for Sarajevo. Y – Serbia saw itself as the centre of anti-Austrian feeling. N – The source is very one-sided.	Y – A supports Germany's view indirectly. Y – E contains references that are largely anti-Serb. N – B contradicts the basis of Germany's case. N – D takes a different view of Austria's police and responsibility.	There is an opportunity to discuss the national and international aspects of Sarajevo.
D	Speech by a leading Italian politician.	Austria planned to attack Serbia before the assassination at Sarajevo in 1914.	Y – Austria pursued an anti-Serbian policy before 1914. Y/N – Sarajevo provoked Austria to take action but probably an exaggeration to describe it as only an excuse. Y/N – Italy was a member of the Triple Alliance in 1914 but unreliable and left it soon after war was declared.	Y – B claims that an Austrian attack on Serbia would not be justified. N – B states that Austrian intentions are peaceful. N – C states that Austrian policies are justified. N – E references show that Serbian ambition was mostly responsible.	The mutual obligations of the Triple Alliance can be explained.
E	Extract from an internet encyclopaedia.	Developments in 1912–13 encouraged Serb ambitions and made Austria determined to crush Serbia.	Y – The sequence of events is described quite accurately. N – The interpretation is of mixed quality. Y/N – Responses can discuss the value of anonymous internet postings.	Y – C sees Serbian nationalism as aggressive and expansionist. N – A claims that the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina was peaceful in intent. N – B claims that Serbian nationalists were defensive. N – D Austria is wrong to explain its policies to Serbia as defensive.	Candidates can use the source as a basis for discussions of tensions before 1914.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	13

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 'Serbia was responsible for the crisis in the Balkans' 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; *'Sources show that Serbia was responsible for the crisis in the Balkans. Source A shows that Austria was trying to bring stability to the region by annexing Bosnia-Herzegovina and giving it prosperity and efficient government while maintaining some local rights. Source C sees Serbia, not Austria, as responsible for the crime at Sarajevo and its consequences. Serbia, not Austria, was risking war again. Source E describes developments in the Balkans over a series of years that demonstrated its expansionist tendencies.'*

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, several sources deny that Serbia was responsible for the crisis in the Balkans. Source B attacks Austrian policies towards Serbia. They threatened the freedom and very existence of the Serbian people. Source D agrees with this criticism of Austria because it planned to attack Serbia before the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo.'*

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; *'An evaluation of the sources contradicts the hypothesis that Serbia was responsible for the crisis in the Balkans. The defence of Austrian policies in Source A is unreliable. It is a one-sided justification for the annexation of an independent region outside the Austrian empire. The annexation was intended to protect Austria, not Bosnia-Herzegovina as the proclamation claims. Source B uses extreme language but the Serbian nationalists were provoked by Austrian policies. Source D is a reliable description of the consequences and interpretation of an Austrian telegram. In theory, the Triple Alliance could only intervene if a member country was attacked. Austria had to pretend that it was being attacked before 1913.'*

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	13

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, other sources can be assessed to confirm the hypothesis that Serbia was responsible for the crisis in the Balkans. Although Source C is one-sided, the basis of Germany’s argument is justified. Serbian nationalists sought more than the independence of Serbia. They sought an enlarged, or greater, Serbia which could be achieved by removing regions from the Austrian empire, thus making a war very likely. The developments described in Source E are convincing. It was in Austria’s interests to maintain stability in the Balkans whereas Serbia’s ambitions were an important reason for the wars before 1913.’*

L6 AS L5, PLUS EITHER (a) EXPLAINS 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; *‘The most convincing source that gives an insight into the tensions in the Balkans by 1914 is Source D. This confirms that Austria was more responsible for the crisis in the Balkans. It is important because the speech was delivered by a leading Italian politician at a time when Italy was an ally of Austria in the Triple Alliance. Sarajevo might have been more than an excuse for Austrian action against Serbia but it confirms that tensions in this region pre-dated Sarajevo. Sources A and C are more one-sided and weigh less as evidence. They both justify Austria but do not take any alternative view into account.’*

OR

‘The sources show that both Austria and Serbia were responsible. Source A is reliable to an extent because it shows Austrian concerns to bring peace to the region while Source B is a clear indication of the danger to peace from extreme nationalist groups. Their threat became even more apparent in 1914 when Narodna Odbrana, also known as the Black Hand, was responsible for the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo. Source E is justified in its claim that Austria was alarmed by previous developments in the Balkans. It saw its empire as being in danger.’

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it.

For example; *‘The hypothesis should be modified. Both Austria and Serbia were responsible for instability in the Balkans but the key development in 1914 was the intervention of Germany. Austria would not have gone to war if had been for Germany’s backing and it is known that some Austrian politicians wanted to adopt a policy that did not go as far as war. This does not prove Serbia’s innocence but Serbia was not strong enough itself to declare war on Austria. In addition, we must make a distinction between the government of Serbia and the extreme nationalists, whose views are expressed in Source B. These carried out the crime at Sarajevo without the knowledge of the government.’*

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	13

Section B

2 How far did the French achieve liberty and equality during the rule of Napoleon from 1799 to 1814?

The key issue is the extent of individual liberty and equality under Napoleon's rule. It is possible to argue that his despotic rule gave little regard to citizens' liberty and quality. Some concessions might include the Concordat which allowed the French to practise Catholicism, or not. The Codes were universal, ending the diversity of customary law in the north and Roman law in the south. The Revolution ended privilege and feudal practices but Napoleon's confirmation of their suppression was more effective. Property was inherited by all male heirs except for a proportion that was allocated to the eldest male heir. On the other hand, the Chapelier Law suppressed associations of employers and of workers. Women and children were disadvantaged by their subjection to husbands/fathers. Divorce was possible but less easy for women than men. The political system was authoritarian. Except for a few of the least important positions, offices were filled by Napoleon's appointees, down to village mayors. During the Consulate, there was a Tribunal and a Legislature but they only rubber-stamped Napoleon's decisions. The Empire took this personal rule further. There were no representative institutions. Education was improved for boys, and their purpose was to provide useful servants of the state. Napoleon was willing to be reconciled to nobles and inaugurated the Legion of Honour. Other steps might be considered in the light of individual liberty and equality. Propaganda, especially through the use of statues and medals, promoted Napoleon's image. A darker side was the extensive use of a police system under Fouché. There were state prisons and political prisoners. The *lettres de cachet* were virtually revived. There was heavy press censorship. Some might argue that, in context, Napoleon's authoritarianism was not exceptionally harsh. It was less violent, extreme and unpredictable than the rule of the Jacobins and probably less corrupt than the Directory. There was more of a rule of law in Britain but Napoleon's France did not compare badly with other European monarchies and especially with the corrupt inefficiencies of many minor princedoms.

3 Assess the benefits that industrialisation brought to governments in the nineteenth century. (You should refer to at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

Responses should refer to at least two of Britain, France and Germany. The assessments of benefits allows responses to discuss problems but a concentration on positive results for governments would not prevent answers achieving high marks. Industrialisation made countries smaller in one respect. Communications with distant provinces made them easier to control. Central governments became stronger. This was true of Britain and France while industrialisation of some German regions, especially Prussia, contributed to its unification and Germany's emergence as a European, then world, power. There were links between the Zollverein, industrial strength and unification. The French Third Republic provided more stability than regimes since 1789 and this was partly caused by the changing economy with France becoming a more industrialised country. Industry led to military strength. Wealth enabled the three countries to increase and modernise their armies. Britain's naval power, and Germany's later, was enhanced as steam ships replaced sail. Industrialisation was a key element of overseas expansion. Raw materials were needed and markets might be developed. In Britain, more than in France and especially Germany, government was modernised as new middle-class men of talent took a hand in politics. In Germany, the Junkers retained their paramount importance – but it might be noted that landed gentry and nobles did not lose their place completely in Britain. It is not an exaggeration that most social reforms arose from men who were interested in the new economy. In Britain, competition rather than patronage became important in the civil service and military. Industrial growth resulted in higher income to governments from taxes. Problems that might be discussed more briefly include the challenge of social conditions that resulted from the rise of an industrial working class. In Britain and France, more than Germany, authoritarianism was challenged.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	13

4 Compare the problems involved in unifying Germany and Italy during the period from 1849 to 1871.

The best responses are likely to take a directly comparative approach. Both countries were recovering from the events of 1848–49. Frederick William IV of Prussia was a relatively liberal ruler who granted a new constitution while retaining authority for himself, control over the army and emergency powers. These were to be important to William I in the 1860s. He was not interested in unification and rejected the offer of the German crown in 1849. Victor Emmanuel II was lazy but sympathetic to liberalism, enforcing the Statuto which conceded a narrowly elected assembly. He appointed Cavour as his Prime Minister but more in order to strengthen Piedmont than to unify Italy. A common problem was that many were unenthusiastic about unification. German liberals supported the idea but the King did not, nor did many German Junkers who were important. Some states were (rightly) suspicious that a unified Germany would be dominated by Prussia. There were similar feelings in Italy where Piedmont was the equivalent of Prussia. Piedmont faced greater economic problems than Prussia. It had worse communications and little industry. Cavour's first task was to re-organise and strengthen Piedmont. He made commercial agreements with other countries and invested in railways. Bismarck came to power because of a crisis over the army. The liberals resisted a budget that would increase the army – under the King's control. Having pushed this through, Bismarck could benefit from the work of Moltke and Roon. Piedmont's army was the strongest in Italy but poor in comparison with major European powers. Cavour could use it as a diplomatic ploy, for example in the Crimean War, but it was not capable itself of delivering victory. Bismarck and Cavour realised the importance of diplomacy if they were to achieve their aims. Bismarck first gained support from Austria as an ally in the Danish war, then defeated it while making friends with France and Russia. Diplomacy was also important in the final war with France. Cavour won the sympathy of France and Britain in the Crimean War, then the support of France at Plombières. German friendship was important after his death to gain Venetia and Germany's contribution was vital in the final acquisition of Rome. Bismarck remained important from the time of his appointment (1862) to 1872 while Cavour died in 1861. The task of complete unification was left to others.

5 'There were more problems than benefits for European countries.' Examine this claim about the effects of 'New Imperialism' in the late nineteenth century. (You should refer to at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is the balance of gains and losses to European countries from imperialism. Responses should refer to named European countries although other countries might also be discussed. Responses should note that the question is European-centred inasmuch as it does not ask about the consequences for indigenous people. These can be discussed briefly in a conclusion but are not part of the main argument. How far there were economic benefits is arguable. Belgium (Leopold II) unexpectedly gained the rich area of the Congo. Italy was less fortunate in Libya and Somaliland. Britain gained gold and diamonds in South Africa and there were economic benefits in China. France and Germany profited less. Empire represented international prestige and power, a factor common to Britain, France and Germany. At the time, people took pride in the claim that they were introducing higher levels of civilisation to Africa – to Asia to a lesser extent. Individual reputations could be made, for example Rhodes and Karl Peters in Africa. Hopes that empires would lessen the pressure of over-population in Europe were not fulfilled. There was large-scale emigration from Europe in the late nineteenth century but not to the New Imperial countries. Empire provided employment for administrators, comparatively few in number, but not for the working population, as was hoped. Public opinion was more divided than has often been thought. Bismarck and Disraeli believed that colonies appealed to voters but the French and Italians were less convinced and their politicians who supported overseas expansion were less popular. Hopes that the growth of empires would alleviate European tensions were dashed. Examples can be taken from Africa and Asia of rivalries that

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	13

were a consequence. Bismarck's Berlin Conference (1884–85) gave a brief respite to tensions. Technological advances might be mentioned, especially the growth of steam-powered ships.

6 'An unexpected and incomplete victory.' Assess this judgement of the Bolsheviks' success in October 1917.

The starting point is open but earlier material, especially before 1914, should be linked to the key issue. In favour of the stated proposition, it might be argued that the Bolsheviks were a small group, partly at the insistence of Lenin who wanted a disciplined group of revolutionaries. They had little success before 1914 with Lenin and other leaders either in exile or in prison. They played a small part in the February 1917 Revolution, which Lenin did not expect. Other reforming and radical groups seemed stronger. The July Days were a setback. A rising of the army at Petrograd and backed by the Bolsheviks was put down by loyal soldiers. Lenin and his colleagues were accused of being German agents. He had to flee to Finland. Against the proposition, answers might point out the leadership of Lenin, in spite of the setbacks. He realised the importance of building an alliance between the peasantry, urban workers and soldiers. Slogans were populist, such as 'All power to the Soviets' and 'Peace, Land and Bread'. These resonated with widespread grievances. Support for Lenin and the Bolsheviks grew. Trotsky, for example, became important when he switched from the Mensheviks. The Kornilov affair proved a turning point. Responses can explain the background of a Provisional Government that struggled to establish itself. It failed to deliver the promises of the February Revolution. The vacuum in power that developed from 1914 was filled by Lenin's decisive leadership. From the small party that had grown from the beginning of the century, the Bolsheviks found themselves in power after their sudden coup in October 1917. But was the victory incomplete? The civil war still had to be fought and eventual success should not mask the danger from the Whites. Other problems facing Lenin show the difficulties facing a Bolshevik government.

7 Which was the more important reason for Hitler's hold on power in Germany from 1933 to 1939: propaganda or terror?

The key issue is the comparative importance of terror and propaganda in Hitler's government to 1939 and the best responses will come to a clear and justified conclusion. Terror was a weapon from the time that Hitler came to power after his apparent reliance on democratic methods. Reference can be made to the SA and SS. They were justified by the alleged dangers to Germany from left-wing extremism, the communists, and from the Jews. The Enabling Act was passed when the socialists were terrorised by the SA. Hitler then used terror against the SA, probably because he suspected the leaders of plotting a coup and also because it was unpopular with the military, whom Hitler wished to cultivate. The law courts were an arm of the government, as were the police. Terror spread to the general population. Real or apparent dissidents were treated harshly. Strong measures were being taken against Jews in the Nuremberg Laws (1935) and Kristallnacht (1938). Propaganda was an important element. Goebbels as Minister for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda was a master of new methods. As well as the traditional censorship of books and newspapers, he realised the potential of the radio and cinema in conveying the regime's message to the masses. Party organisations for workers and the young gave an impression of national cohesion. They concealed, not always successfully, the control that they represented. Mass meetings were used, with Hitler's speeches often being the climax. Education was controlled. The power of the churches was curbed. The government also used the propaganda of economic success. The figures for output and employment did improve but they were also exaggerated. It is possible for responses to go wider into foreign policy but this should be linked to propaganda. Hitler's success in overturning the Versailles settlement was contrasted to the actions of the 'November criminals' in the Weimar Republic. An expansion of Germany into Austria and Czechoslovakia was sold as the justified reunion of Germans.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	13

8 Who had the greater effect on nineteenth-century Europe: Bismarck or Napoleon?

The key issue is the comparative effects on Europe of Bismarck and Napoleon. The best responses will make a deliberate attempt at comparison. Internal developments in Germany/Prussia and France could be made relevant but should not comprise a major part of answers. Bismarck made Prussia/Germany into a major European power. By 1900, Germany possessed the best army in Europe and was a rapidly growing naval power. Prussia changed from a significant but not pre-eminent German state into a country that was at the heart of European diplomacy. Bismarck helped Italy to achieve independence and played a major part in the re-definition of Austria's role in Europe. His war with France exposed the weakness of that country but it also created a hostility that was to last beyond 1900. It was a major influence on the diplomacy of all countries. Napoleon's short term achievement was to make France the centre of a European wide empire. He dominated diplomacy until at least 1815. His final defeat was a major setback but his influence continued indirectly in the rise of liberalism and nationalism. Although he opposed these during his years of power, he was seen in hindsight as a champion of both. German and Italian liberals and nationalists benefited to some extent from his weakening of autocratic governments. A sequential description which contains valid comments and accurate knowledge would be rewarded.