



**General Certificate of Education
June 2013**

AS History 1041 HIS1K

Unit 1K

Russia and Germany 1871–1914

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level students. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Students who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b): AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which students meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a student performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that students might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other students' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a student with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

June 2013

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1K: Russia and Germany, 1871–1914

Question 1

01 Explain why Bismarck fell from power in 1890. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Bismarck fell from power in 1890

Students may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- the chancellor in Germany was appointed by the Kaiser and was dependent on him for continuing in office. Bismarck had been dominant in the reign of Wilhelm I because he always had the support of the emperor, with a new emperor there was always the possibility that the support could disappear

- Bismarck was also a very dominant figure and it was likely that a more forceful emperor would find that difficult to bear. When Wilhelm II became emperor it was very clear that he wished to take a more active role. His comment about letting ‘the old man shuffle on’ before letting him go, may be quoted
- the above point may be developed by reference to the personalities of both the Kaiser and Bismarck

and some of the following short term/immediate factors:

- policy differences, most notably over the renewal of the Anti-Socialist laws may be referred to in some detail as being a trigger for the final argument between the emperor and his chancellor
- Bismarck was also in a weakened position, his support in the Reichstag was diminished and this removed one more element of support
- the Kaiser and Bismarck argued about the access of ministers to the emperor, which was a key factor
- foreign policy disagreements led Bismarck to believe that the emperor was interfering and then to a violent quarrel. Bismarck offered his resignation, which was accepted.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might link the dependence of the chancellor on the emperor’s good will to the short term problems between Bismarck and Wilhelm.

Question 1

02 How far did Wilhelm II control domestic policies in Germany in the years 1890 to 1914?
(24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors suggesting Wilhelm controlled domestic policies in Germany might include:

- the emperor appointed chancellors and without his support they fell from power. Examples for this include Caprivi, and although he was an independent chancellor, his appointment and his ability to follow a new course stemmed from the fact that at this stage he and the Emperor were broadly in agreement about domestic policy. Von Bulow also had broad agreement with the Kaiser and the policy of Sammlungspolitik followed in this period was in accordance with the emperor's wishes
- the appointment and resignation of Hohenlohe, who lacked the support of the Kaiser; the resignation of von Bülow himself when he had lost the Kaiser's support
- the control exerted by the Emperor is also seen as an imperative to secure budgets for military expansion, which were, by and large, achieved in this period.

Factors suggesting that Wilhelm had very little control over domestic policy might include:

- the view from many commentators that Wilhelm was a 'Shadow Emperor' who actually had very little control over policy. Support for this might include
- the continued growth of the SPD despite Wilhelm's desire to suppress the party after 1894. Repeated attempts to pass Anti-Subversion Bills through the Reichstag show the lack of control exercised by Kaiser and ministers
- the independent policies of chancellors, most notably, Caprivi and von Bulow: Hohenlohe, despite being a 'straw doll' was able to prevent the Kaiser from attempting to overthrow the constitution
- towards the end of this time period, government was virtually blocked by the role of opposition groups in the Reichstag and that the Kaiser also showed very little interest in domestic policy at this stage.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that there is debate on the issue of how much control the Kaiser had over domestic policies.

Question 2

03 Explain why there was a march to the Winter Palace in January 1905. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why there was a march to the Winter Palace in January 1905

Students may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- long term economic issues caused dissatisfaction with the regime, conditions in both the countryside and the new industrial areas were poor, with low wages and frequent famines. Unions grew in the towns and there were frequent strikes
- political repression and the lack of political opportunities for opposition meant that groups advocating liberal reform and socialist revolution were gaining support

and some of the following short-term/immediate factors:

- the long term issues of opposition were not helped by the economic conditions of the early 1900s, there were more famines and more hardship in the industrial towns and the growth of unions and of economic hardship led to an inflamed situation by 1905. This was made worse by the impact of the Russo Japanese war. The situation in January 1905 was particularly bad as Russia had lost Port Arthur in December
- unions sponsored by the Okhrana had been attempted as a way of dealing with worker unrest. Although this idea had been abandoned by 1905, a union on the same lines had been set up by Father Gapon, a police informer. Shortages caused by the war had helped to cause a strike at the Putilov iron works in St Petersburg. Many of the strikers were in Father Gapon's union. He organised the march to the palace hoping that the Tsar would take action to alleviate suffering.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons and may link the long and short term reasons with some priority.

Question 2

- 04** How successful was the tsarist regime in dealing with opposition in the years 1906 to 1914? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors suggesting that the tsarist regime was successful in overcoming opposition might include:

- the era of the Dumas enabled the regime to continue in power. Although the first Dumas were too radical for the Tsar to tolerate, it was possible for his ministers to change the electoral process in order to achieve Dumas that were easier for the Tsar's ministers to manage. Some members of the rebellious and radical first Duma fled and the resulting Vyborg manifesto received little support. The regime reasserted its authority with the Fundamental Laws in 1906, which reaffirmed the 'principles of autocracy'
- Stolypin was appointed to deal with both political and violent unrest. He used a combination of repression and concession to deal with wider discontent and dissolved the second Duma because of their opposition. The voting arrangements were modified to ensure that the Dumas were more obedient and the regime certainly found it easier to control the last two Dumas, both of which lasted a full term
- opposition political groups remained weak and lacked force as a threat. The Social Democrats were split and repression ensured that many of their leaders were in exile. The Social Revolutionaries also excluded themselves from the political process
- by 1914 there seemed to be a great deal of support for the regime and outbreak of war was greeted with patriotic enthusiasm.

Factors suggesting that the tsarist regime was not successful in dealing with opposition might include:

- although political opposition through the Dumas was controlled, opposition throughout the countryside remained more problematic. Violence continued into 1907, in that year approximately 1,231 officials and 1,768 ordinary Russians were assassinated. Stolypin's repression reduced this figure but did not stop it. His assassination in 1911 is evidence of that
- the first two Dumas showed that the regime was unable to deal with opposition without using repression. The Dumas made it difficult for government legislation to be passed and had to be dissolved twice before the regime could achieve some control. Although the third and fourth Dumas were more amenable there was opposition which was preventing the system working effectively by 1911
- the opposition groups were repressed and forced underground but this did not stop the growth of opposition through effective organisation. The situation in the countryside and in the towns was helped by a series of good harvests and economic growth, however, the underlying causes of discontent remained. By 1912 there was a further wave of strikes and discontent, most notably in the Lena goldfields. The continued growth of the working class in the cities and the repression of opposition created a constant danger of violent opposition and the growth of political opposition throughout the country.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that the tsarist regime had some success in dealing with opposition but that this success was limited and often dependent on economic prosperity. Opposition groups remained and without sincere reform the regime could not quiet its opponents completely.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why Germany signed the Dual Alliance with Austria-Hungary in 1879. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Germany signed the Dual Alliance with Austria-Hungary.

Students may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- Bismarck was aware that, despite the Dreikaiserbund, it was likely that at some stage Germany would have to choose between Austria-Hungary and Russia, events such as the 'War in Sight Crisis' may have given him some indication that firm support for Germany was more likely to come from Austria-Hungary than from Russia
- Bismarck was also conscious of the close ties between Germany and Austria-Hungary in terms of language and culture. He was also aware that large numbers of southern Germans looked to Austria-Hungary and would be more reconciled to the new Reich if there was a closer relationship

and some of the following short-term/immediate factors:

- Bismarck was aware of the damage done to Germany's relationship with Russia at the Congress of Berlin, the previous year. He believed that a firm relationship with Austria-Hungary would strengthen his international position, possibly persuading Russia that improved relations with Germany were more desirable
- the move was also a retaliation against the anti-German feeling in Russia and the imposition of tariffs which had damaged German exports. There was also the possibility that the alliance with Austria-Hungary would open up more trade along the Danube.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might link Bismarck's long term recognition of the need to take sides with the impact of the Congress of Berlin.

Question 3

- 06** How far was the worsening relations between Germany and Russia in the years 1879 to 1909 due to the Dual Alliance of 1879? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors suggesting that worsening relations between Germany and Russia were due to the Dual Alliance might include:

- the Alliance appeared to be directed against Russia, with both powers agreeing to help each other in the case of a Russian attack
- there was also a strong likelihood of conflict between Russia and Austria- Hungary over issues in the Balkans, and this alliance meant that it was likely that Germany would be pulled in
- although the alliance was a secret, enough was known to increase Russia's unease and feeling of isolation
- the Triple Alliance of 1882, further increased the divisions in Europe and possibly increased the importance of France finding an international ally
- by 1887 it was clear that the Dreikaiserbund could not be renewed and this limited Bismarck's ability to broker between Russia and Austria-Hungary
- when Wilhelm II came to power in 1888, he felt that the alliance with Austria-Hungary was not compatible with the Reinsurance Treaty, so the treaty was not renewed in 1890, leaving the way open for a Russian alliance with France
- Balkan issues returned to the fore in the Bosnian Crisis of 1908.

Factors suggesting that worsening relations between Russia and Germany were due to other factors might include:

- it was issues in the Balkans that were the key factor in worsening relations between Russia and Germany, Bismarck's alliance simply recognised the fact that Germany would eventually have to take sides between the two
- a new Dreikaiserbund was signed in 1881, showing that perhaps Bismarck's strategy of isolating Russia was successful in increasing their desire to maintain good relations
- the Reinsurance Treaty was another indication that despite the alliance Russia and Germany were maintaining good relations, and it was only the fall of Bismarck and the new aggressive foreign policy of Wilhelm II that led to the lapsing of the agreement.
- financial issues led to worsening relations, Germany had imposed tariffs on Russian grain and also refused to supply capital for Russian development
- increasingly good relations between Russia and France led to worsening relations especially after the development of the Ententes between Britain, France and Russia from 1904–1907.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that the alliance did have an impact on relations between the two countries, but will also consider the impact of other factors.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion