

General Certificate of Education

History 5041/6041

Alternative D Revolution, Conservatism and Nationalism in Europe, 1789–1914

Mark Scheme

2006 examination – June series

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 meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting 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 candidates' 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.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1:

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:

Either

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:

Either

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:

Either

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

Alternative D: Revolution, Conservatism and Nationalism in Europe, 1789–1914

AS Unit 1: Revolution and Conservatism in France and Europe, 1789–1825

Question 1

- (a) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the importance of ‘Continental Blockade’ (line 2) in the context of Napoleon’s economic policies. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. limited reference to the fact that the Continental Blockade was an economic policy directed against Britain. **1**

- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the Blockade was an example of one of Napoleon’s policies to strengthen the economy of France and weaken that of its enemy Britain. British goods were banned from entering any French territory. Candidates may use their own knowledge to refer to the Berlin Decrees of 1806 or the Milan Decrees of 1807 which were imposed to strengthen the Blockade. **2-3**

- (b) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how **Source A** challenges the views put forward in **Source B** about the impact of the Continental System on France during the reign of Napoleon. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context. Includes very brief reference to positive views of Source B, e.g. “positively benefited” to the more negative views of Source C, e.g. “a liability for France”. **1-2**

- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge to develop the contrasting views of the impact of the Continental System on France, e.g. Source B argues that the Continental System strengthened areas of the French economy, e.g. exports, luxuries, silk. In contrast, Source C states that the Continental System caused “economic disruption”, and ruined the linen

industry and harmed the shipbuilding industry. Own knowledge may include brief reference to how the Blockade of Britain prevented the import of British goods and the export of French goods to Britain, therefore having a negative impact on areas around the French coast. **3-5**

- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions. In addition to the differences of the sources, the similarities may also be examined, e.g. Source B is not all positive and agrees that coastal areas of France were hit hard by the Continental System and that France only “benefited for a time”, i.e. that positive results were not long lasting. Candidates who use their own knowledge to argue that Napoleon's attempt to extend the Continental System into Spain and Russia was ultimately the cause of further conflict and his downfall are clearly Level 3. **6-7**

- (c) Use **Sources A, B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Explain the importance of the Continental System, in relation to other factors, in explaining the growing opposition to Napoleonic rule in France and the Empire. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* the sources. **1-4**

- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**

- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

There is debate about the impact of the Continental System on France as illustrated by **Source A** and **Source B**, therefore candidates may argue that the Continental System was the main reason for the growth of opposition to Napoleonic rule, or they may argue that factors such as the war, poor harvests, natural disasters, or the nature of Napoleon’s dictatorship were more important.

Evidence from the sources:

Source A – expresses that the Continental System was “a liability for France”, “caused economic disruption” and kept France in a “Pre-industrial state”.

Source B – provides evidence that the Continental System protected the French economy and provided markets for French goods within the empire, e.g. “opportunity to export goods ... outlying parts of the Empire”.

Source C – provides evidence that the Continental System “caused serious discontent in the French Empire” and fuelled the rise of “national resistance movements”.

At Level 1 candidates will make assertions about the importance of the Continental blockade and the growth of opposition. Level 2 answers will either describe the growth of opposition/Continental System or they will attempt an argument about the importance of the Continental System with little secure supporting evidence or balance. Level 3 responses will have generally secure supporting evidence about the importance of the Continental System and a limited range of other factors linked to the growth of opposition. At Level 3 it is not necessary to have a balanced response and candidates may not address the issue of opposition within the Empire in any depth. At Level 4 the Continental System should be ranged against a number of other factors and linked securely to the growth of opposition. Answers should be balanced and there should be some attempt to address policy in France and the Empire (but by no means equally). At Level 5 answers should demonstrate judgment about the importance of the Continental System against a range of other factors within France and the Empire.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by ‘the *ancien régime*’ (line 2) in the context of the French Revolution. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the system of government that the French Revolutionaries wished to overthrow. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. references to the ‘old regime’, the organisation of government and society based on hierarchy, perhaps some discussion of the system of estates. Understanding that the revolutionaries wished to reduce the monarch’s power and create a system based upon the ‘principles of 1789’ – liberty, equality and fraternity. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Robespierre established a dictatorship in December 1793. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. to protect the Revolution from ‘foreign and internal enemies’. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Robespierre created a dictatorship because of the need to protect the Revolution from internal enemies, e.g. federalist revolts in Normandy, Bordeaux and Lyons, counter-revolutionaries, such as refractory priests, aristocrats and the counter-revolutionary revolt in the Vendée; the need to protect the Revolution from external enemies, e.g. countries involved in the war against France. Robespierre’s belief in creating a ‘Republic of Virtue’; the need to re-establish order following the period of anarchic terror led by the *sans-culottes*. Candidates need to refer to more than one of the above examples, or other suitable reasons. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. candidates may question the extent to which the Revolution was under threat in December 1793 as internal revolts were being crushed and French armies were on the offensive. Candidates will understand that the 14 Frimaire put the Revolution into reverse as power was re-centralised and put into the hands of a few. They may also stress the need of Robespierre and the CPS to rein in the power and influence of the *sans-culottes*. **6-7**

- (c) ‘In the years 1789 to 1794 the Revolution failed to bring liberty and equality to the French people.’
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **9-11**

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Effective answers will assess the extent to which the French Revolution brought ‘liberty and equality’ to the population of France over time. Better answers will try to define the different groups in society which made up the ‘French people’ and look to the extent to which they gained freedoms and equality of opportunity in the period. The August Decrees of 1789 signalled the end of noble power, the end of the feudal system, and established the right to fair taxation, whilst the Declaration of the Rights of Man 1789 laid down the principles on which the new constitution of France was to be based. The work of the Constituent Assembly brought about the most lasting political freedoms for the French people in the period 1789–1791. A constitutional monarchy was established, the right to vote was given to ‘active citizens’, justice was to be free, fair, and available to everyone. However, not everyone benefited from these freedoms; only 61% of men could vote, no women could, and the bourgeoisie were the main beneficiaries of meritocracy. Many of the freedoms won in this period were lost under the rule of the Jacobins and the period of Terror. The controls introduced by the Jacobins to deal with the wartime emergence, e.g. the Revolutionary Tribunal, CPS, CGS, *armées révolutionnaires*, undermined the principles of liberty and equality, whilst going some way to ensuring a supply of food to the poor. Under the Jacobins the nobility were persecuted, whilst the demands of the *sans-culottes* were granted (for a time).

Level 1 answers will either make vague assertions about liberty and equality or give an incomplete narrative about the course of the Revolution. At Level 2, answers will be more descriptive of some of the reforms introduced during the Revolution. At Level 3 there will be a brief attempt to qualify the impact of the Revolution on liberty and equality with some attempt to address positive and negative aspects. Level 4 answers will be balanced with a range of secure evidence and distinguish (however briefly), between liberty and equality. At Level 5 judgement about the positive or negative impact of the Revolution on liberty and equality will be made through an examination of the different social groups in France.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by the ‘Congress of Vienna’ (line 1) in the context of international relations in 1815. **(3 marks)**

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it brought about the end of the Napoleonic wars. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the Congress of Vienna redrew the map of Europe, established the balance of power and led to the Congress System which was supposed to solve future disputes between the Great Powers peacefully. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why France was ‘contained but not excluded’ (line 3) from international relations in the period 1815 to 1825. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. to prevent another war, fear of France as a source of revolution and aggression. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. to explain why France was ‘contained and not excluded’. France was contained by a number of measures to ensure peace was maintained and to prevent future French aggression. Examples of containment included: the creation of a ‘cordon sanitaire’ – small buffer states to prevent French expansion in the future, and the signing of the Quadruple Alliance – to strengthen the unity of the Great Powers against future French expansionism. France was not excluded from international relations because Castlereagh, and to some extent Metternich, believed that European peace and stability could not be maintained if France was resentful and sought revenge against a harsh peace settlement. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance. Responses which clearly understand that Britain, Austria and Prussia were also worried about the expansionist aim of Russia and wished to maintain relations with France in order to counter-attack any Russian threat are clearly Level 3. **6-7**

- (c) ‘The Congress of Vienna was successful in tackling the problems that the statesmen saw at that time in the years to 1825.’
Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **9-11**

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Successful answers will attempt to define the aims of the Congress of Vienna, e.g. to restore peace, contain France and Russia, restore legitimism, and establish a balance of power. On the surface the Congress of Vienna did achieve its aims as peace was maintained until the outbreak of the Crimean War, France was contained without the terms being too punitive and France was readmitted into the alliance in 1818. Russian ambitions in the east were also constrained. However, the extent to which this was a great success can be debated. The Vienna Settlement has been criticised for failing to deal adequately with the demands of liberalism and nationalism, especially in the German and Italian states and the period 1815–1848 has been labelled the ‘Age of Revolutions’. Legitimism was attacked as reactionary. It has also been argued that the Vienna Settlement was incomplete; the problems of the declining Ottoman Empire were completely ignored, whilst the settlement relied heavily upon the Great Powers’ ability to co-operate and endorse it. This proved increasingly difficult as incidents in the various Congress prove.

At Level 1, answers are likely to make undeveloped statements about the Congress of Vienna. At Level 2 agreement or disagreement with the statement will be inferred through a description of the Vienna Settlement OR have a limited overview of the impact of Vienna with little secure supporting evidence. Level 3 answers will demonstrate some understanding of one side of the debate. At Level 4 answers will be balanced and have secure examples of success and failure of the Congress of Vienna throughout the period. At Level 5 judgement will be demonstrated about varying degrees of success of the Congress of Vienna.

Alternative D: Revolution, Conservatism and Nationalism in Europe, 1789–1914

A2 Unit 4: Nationalism and the State, Europe 1814–1914

Question 1

- (a) Use **Sources C** and **D** and your own knowledge.

How fully does **Source C** support the view put forward in **Source D** about the influence of the aristocracy in France in the years 1851 to 1914? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. **6-8**
- L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

Level 1 answers will demonstrate uncontrolled use of the sources and limited recognition of the contrasting views; Source C sees aristocratic influence through the army as a threat to the Third Republic, whereas Source D claims that “aristocratic control began to unravel”. Level 2 answers will demonstrate that both sources have some areas of agreement/disagreement about the influence of the aristocracy. Both sources state that the aristocracy lost political influence under Napoleon III; “loss of political influence” in Source C and “eroded their rural power base” in Source D. However, Source C argues that through the politicised armed forces the aristocracy maintained enough influence to be considered “a danger to the Republic”, whereas Source D claims that they “lack a coherent political strategy”. Level 3 answers will begin to explicitly use their own knowledge about the aristocracy in order to draw conclusions about their influence. They may refer to the rise of the bourgeoisie and their political power, the growth of industrialisation eroding aristocratic power, the lack of political unity, the impact of defeat at Sedan, Boulanger and Dreyfus on the influence of the aristocratic stronghold of the armed forces. At Level 4 conclusions will be sustained throughout the answer and there will be an attempt to balance evidence from the sources and own knowledge about the influence of the aristocracy in the period.

(b) Use **Sources A, B, C and D** and your own knowledge.

Consider the extent to which social and political divisions within conservative groups account for the political instability in France in the years 1814 to 1914. (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

This is the synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question.

Any effective answer should attempt to define conservative groups in France as those who desired stability, order, defence of property, etc. The pillars of French conservatism were the Church, Army and aristocracy. There were a range of groups in French society who were traditionally conservative in outlook, for example the upper and petite bourgeoisie and peasantry, whose interest conflicted with the aristocracy. Despite a broad consensus of how France should ideally be, there were many political divisions within conservative groups. Monarchists were divided between Bourbon and Orleanists. Some conservatives supported Bonapartism, others a conservative Republic, whilst some were even drawn to the right wing nationalism of the proto-fascist Leagues. The failure of conservative groups to present a united social and political front created periods of political upheaval in France, most notably the 1830 and 1848 Revolutions and the political paralysis of 1879 which enabled the victory

of the Republicans over McMahon and firmly established the arguably politically unstable Third Republic. However, it can also be argued that conservative groups helped to restore order and stability to France on a number of occasions, for example the crushing of the June Days (1848), the coup of Napoleon III and establishment of the Second Empire, the quashing of the Paris Commune in 1871. In addition, there were many other factors which contributed to the political instability of France in the period. Examples may include: the personality and mistakes of rulers, most notably Charles X and Louis-Philippe; fluctuations in the economy (especially in 1848); foreign policy (as in the case of Napoleon III and defeat at Sedan); the growth of liberalism and republicanism (a factor in the Revolutions in 1830 and 1848); the growth of radicalism and socialism (evident in the wave of militant strike action between 1905–1908).

Evidence from the sources may include:

Source A – the divisions caused by the Ultra movement during the rule of the Bourbons, in particular Charles X, “nobles and non-nobles”.

Source B – gives examples of how conservative groups failed to rally and support Louis-Philippe in 1848, but turned their attentions to Louis Napoleon, “a new conservative icon”, “added a new element to the normal conservative agenda”.

Source C – stresses the strength of aristocratic interests in the army, one branch of conservative interests.

Source D – illustrates the lack of “coherent political strategy”.

Level 1 responses will tend to assert or describe incidents of political instability. Level 2 responses will demonstrate a limited and at times implicit understanding through descriptive narrative about the impact of conservative interests on the political instability of France. At Level 3 both the sources and own knowledge must be used to demonstrate a more explicit understanding of the social and political divisions within French conservatism, linked more securely to political instability – evidence may not be secure across the period. At Level 3 there may be more focus on other factors which promoted political stability/instability. Level 4 responses will be balanced and have a secure range of evidence (but not all encompassing) over the 100 years. At Level 5 judgement will be demonstrated.

Section B

Question 2 onward

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates’ responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: ***Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: Either

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

OPTION A: Italian Unification, 1848–1871

Question 2

‘The failures of the 1848 revolutions in the Italian States were due to the divisions within the ranks of the revolutionaries, rather than to the strengths of the conservative forces.’

To what extent do you agree with this view? **(20 marks)**

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

There were a number of internal and external factors which led to the downfall of the 1848 Revolutions. Candidates need to discuss the extent to which revolutionaries were divided and connect these divisions to a lack of decisive action and also discuss the impact of the

recovery of conservatism in the form of Austrian and French military power on the defeat of the revolutionaries.

Divisions within the ranks of the Italian revolutionaries include ideological/political ones due to the influence of the nationalist writers, Mazzini, Balbo and Gioberti. Gioberti and the neo-guelphs' hopes of a united Italy led by the Pope were killed by the refusal of Pius IX to put himself at the head of the nationalist cause. The radical republicanism of Mazzini and the Roman Republic, Daniele Manin and the Republic of Venice lacked support from other regions of Italy. Geographical divisions ranged from inter-state rivalry which prevented co-ordination, different aims for different states' uprisings (e.g. Milan and Venetia wanted to overthrow Austrian rule, Sicily wanted independence from Naples and Bourbon rule, whilst the revolutionaries in Naples, Tuscany, Piedmont and the Papal States wanted to secure a more representative and liberal government). The revolutionaries were also divided socially and culturally as they were mainly driven by the middle classes who feared a social revolution and 'mob rule' (illustrated by Ferdinand II staging a successful counter-revolution in Naples), and who had little mass support due to their lack of understanding of the plight of the peasantry. There was a lack of awareness about national identity due to overwhelming illiteracy and scores of local dialects. Although Charles Albert had the superficial appearance of leading the Italian nation in its bid for freedom against Austria, in reality his requirement for allies to submit to Piedmontese control intensified political divisions. Therefore the revolutionaries differed in aims, lacked cohesion and co-ordination.

The return of European stability and the swift recovery of the Austrian government ensured the decisive defeat of the Italian Revolutionaries. Within a month conservative forces led by Radetzky claimed victory at Custoza, thus subduing all of Lombardy and Venetia (with the exception of Venice). Piedmont was defeated again in 1849 at Novara; and the Austrian navy destroyed the Republic declared in Venice. The French forces of Louis Napoleon defeated the Roman Republic in June 1849. It is therefore arguable that the key factor in the collapse of the revolutions was the reassertion of conservative military might.

Level 1 responses will possibly narrate the course of the revolutions, or make vague assertions about the failure of the revolutions. At Level 2, responses will examine the failure of the revolutions with little explicit focus on divisions within the revolutionaries or the strengths of conservative forces. Level 3 answers will begin to make explicit links between divisions within the ranks of the revolutionaries and failure with some limited discussion of Austrian military recovery. At Level 4, responses will be balanced, and at Level 5 judgement about key factors in the failure of the revolutions will be made, supported by well selected and wide ranging evidence.

Question 3

To what extent was the foreign policy of Piedmont, rather than the decline of Austria, responsible for the unification of Italy in the years 1852 to 1871? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Decline of Austria

Austria was the major barrier to Italian unification in the period, yet following the successful quashing of the 1848–1849 revolutions the Austrian Empire was in political and economic decline. In 1853, all of non-Austrian dominated Germany was joined in the Zollverein, thus weakening Austrian economic power. Austria's refusal to join in the Crimean War effectively isolated her diplomatically. The war of 1859 failed to drive the Austrians out of northern Italy, but it did effectively end Austria's tradition of supporting conservative governments in central and southern Italy. The ascendancy of Prussia and the appointment of Bismarck as Minister-President of Prussia in 1862 had an important effect on Austrian rule in Italy. The military victory of Prussia against Austria at Sadowa resulted in the transfer of Venice to Italy via Louis Napoleon.

Foreign Policy of Piedmont

Under Cavour the foreign policy of Piedmont firmly placed the 'Italian question' in the general context of European diplomacy. Piedmont's military contribution to the Crimean War, although limited, entitled Cavour to a place at the Congress of Paris in 1856. However, Cavour failed to achieve a diplomatic initiative but he gained the gratitude of Britain and France, which would be crucial if and when Piedmont were to militarily challenge Austrian rule. Cavour's negotiations with Napoleon secured the Plombieres agreement of July 1858, which ensured French help to drive the Austrians out of Italy. The extent to which this was a triumph for the foreign policy of Piedmont can be questioned as Napoleon had his own motives to gain greater territory and to improve diplomatic relations with Austria as can be seen by the 'betrayal' at Villafranca, where Piedmont's ambitions had to take second place to Napoleon's diplomacy.

Other factors

Domestic issues were just as important in securing the unification of Italy. Piedmont's economic expansion, the annexation of the central Italian states, the actions of Garibaldi and the ranks of The Thousand which secured the unification of North and South. At the same time the external rule of Prussia also secured the territories of Venice and Rome.

Level 1 responses will narrate the course of unification. At Level 2, responses may be more descriptive with mainly implicit links to the foreign policy of Piedmont and the decline of Austria. Level 3 answers will have more secure evidence about the issues and will begin to make judgments (possibly in the form of a conclusion). Level 4 responses will be balanced with explicit links and secure evidence about a range of factors which were responsible for

the unification of Italy. Level 5 responses will have clear judgement and a well developed line of argument about the impact of Piedmont's foreign policy and the decline of Austria ranged against a number of other factors.

Question 4

To what extent were the weaknesses of Italy in 1871 the result of the political dominance of Piedmont rather than of economic and cultural divisions? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The political dominance of Piedmont and the process of Piedmontisation intensified the economic and cultural problems of the newly unified Italy. Economically there was a north-south divide, whilst culturally local dialect in the south and widespread illiteracy effectively removed the region from the electorate. The Statuto ensured that the model of strong central government and weak local government prevailed, exacerbating local issues. Piedmont's imposition of regressive indirect taxation to pay off her huge debts was fiercely resented. The removal of internal trade barriers damaged the already weakened southern economy. Piedmont's religious laws formally separated Church and State and was seen as an attack on the Catholic Church, intensifying opposition to the State from those in the south. The Brigand's War (1860–1866) expressed the bitter resentment of those Neapolitans who wanted the restoration of the Bourbons, the powers of the Catholic Church and local autonomy, rather than a unified Italy led by Piedmont. Sicily revolted in 1866 against the oppressive rule from the North and conscription.

Level 1 answers will assert or narrate Italian weaknesses. Level 2 responses may describe the condition of Italy with mainly implicit links to the political dominance of Piedmont, economic and cultural divisions. At Level 3 there will be an explicit understanding and a range of evidence about reasons for the weaknesses of Italy in 1871, but answers may not be secure on one section. Level 4 responses will be balanced and have a secure range of evidence which is well selected and in some depth. At Level 5 clear judgment will be demonstrated about the impact of Piedmont's political dominance on the newly unified Italy and the extent to which it was responsible for the weaknesses of the new state.

OPTION B: Russia, 1848–1881

Question 5

‘Russia’s defeat in the Crimean War exposed the ineffectiveness of Nicholas I’s economic and political policies.’

To what extent do you agree with this view?

(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The Crimean War exposed the illusion (created by Nicholas I’s decisive action to crush the 1848–1849 revolutions in Europe) that Russia was stable and at the peak of her powers. Russia did not have the necessary economic or industrial base to supply the army properly, and it did not have an effective transport system or an efficient bureaucracy to organise or move the little supplies there were. Nicholas’s legacy was an increasingly backward economy based largely on the outmoded serf system, a nobility on the brink of bankruptcy, an inefficient bureaucratic system and the basis for a radical opposition in the intelligentsia, who were alienated from the Tsarist regime and opponents to autocracy. Whilst it is true that Nicholas I’s economic and political policies were largely ineffective, some progress was made. Under Count Kankrin, Minister of Finance, the national debt was reduced, the rouble stabilised and foreign trade increased by 250%. Russia maintained her 3.7% share of world trade, whilst output of pig iron almost doubled. However, progress was much slower in an age where the other European countries were developing their economies at a much faster rate. Politically it would seem that Nicholas I was a successful Tsar as Russia was relatively unaffected by the Revolutions which swept most of Europe in 1848. Centralised control and the powerful Third Section appeared to maintain order and discipline, but Nicholas’s rigid control of government caused inefficiency.

Level 1 responses will either assert the ineffectiveness of Nicholas I’s reforms or narrate the period 1848–1855. At Level 2, answers will be more descriptive about Nicholas I’s rule with mainly implicit focus on his legacy. At Level 3 there will be some explicit connections made between his economic and political policies and defeat in the Crimea. Level 4 answers will have a balanced argument about the impact of Nicholas I’s policies, with some positive (if limited) outlook. Level 5 responses will display clear judgement and secure knowledge.

Question 6

To what extent was Tsarist rule in Russia strengthened rather than weakened by Alexander II's reforms in the years 1861 to 1881? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

This question is asking candidates to judge the effectiveness of Alexander II's reforms. They need to question the extent to which the 'Tsar Liberator' strengthened or weakened Tsardom. Descriptions of Alexander's reforms are not in themselves very useful, what is required is an assessment of their impact on the Tsarist regime in Russia.

Evidence that the reforms strengthened Tsarist rule

The economic backwardness of Russia threatened the security of Tsarist rule and some of Alexander's reforms helped to improve matters. The emancipation of the serfs had some benefits for Russia's economy, export of grain did increase and there was a gradual movement of labour to the towns where wage labour helped to provide a base for consumer goods. Banking and company organisations increased as did the output of coal and iron and the number of railways. The railways improved the export of grain and communication links within the empire. The creation of zemstvas and Dumas created a new system of local government.

Evidence that the reforms weakened Tsarist rule

It can be argued that Alexander II as "Tsar Liberator" increased radical and revolutionary opposition to the Tsarist regime and therefore seriously undermined and weakened it. The reforms he introduced did not go far enough; they raised expectations of change without satisfying the aspirations of many Russians. Superficially reforms such as the establishment of zemstvas, the emancipation of many serfs, etc. appeared to bring Russia into line with the more liberal Western European states, but in reality the regime remained autocratic and subject to few restraints. Due to the police system, harsh punishment and censorship, opposition to the regime who wanted increased reform turned to radical and revolutionary methods, hence the creation of groups like the "People's Will". Able candidates will argue that the Tsarist system was at odds with political and economic reform and that any attempt to 'liberalise' Russia whilst maintaining an unquestionable system of autocracy was bound to subject the regime to harsh and vocal criticism.

Level 1 answers will superficially narrate the course of Alexander II's reforms. Level 2 answers will have more descriptive detail about Alexander II's reforms (not always focused specifically on political and economic, there may be reference to legal, army, social reforms, etc.). At Level 3 understanding will be demonstrated more explicitly about how reforms strengthened/weakened Tsarist rule. Level 4 responses will have a clear and explicit understanding of the positive and negative impact of Alexander II's reforms. At Level 5 judgement will be made about the state of autocracy in the last years of Alexander II's reign and conclusion drawn about the impact of his reforms of Tsarist rule.

Question 7

‘The most significant opposition to Alexander II’s reforms came from the forces of conservatism, not from liberal and radical movements.’

To what extent do you agree with this view?

(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The forces of conservatism (members of the imperial court, the nobility, high ranking officers in the armed forces, the Orthodox Church) should be defined in an effective answer. These conservative groups had the most to lose from the reformation of the Tsarist system of government, as they were the ones who wielded power, influence and status. The nobility delayed the drawing up of the Emancipation Decree for four years and managed to extract some minor concessions from Alexander II. Traditionalists in the army and conservative elements of government were opposed to Milutin’s reforms, especially the establishment of Junker schools and the Manifesto and Statute on Universal Military Service. These reforms ensured that in the area of conscription the son of the lowest peasant was theoretically treated the same as the son of a highest noble. Only the full support of the Tsar enabled Milutin to force the army reforms through. The education reforms of Golovin were thought to be too liberal by the forces of conservatism, so Alexander replaced him with the more conservative Tolstoy, who had close links with the Orthodox Church, to keep the effects of the liberal changes in check. Opposition from the forces of conservatism prevented Alexander II’s reforms from going far enough, which incensed the liberal and radical opposition groups. Liberal and radical opposition did not have as much power and influence as the conservatives and were subjected to the repressive nature of the Tsarist regime. These opposition groups were divided ideologically and tactically. Populists saw the peasantry as the heart of a new society and encouraged education, whereas groups like ‘Land and Liberty’ and ‘People’s Will’ developed as terrorist organisations. Between 1879 and 1880 Alexander II survived three attempts on his life and was eventually assassinated in March 1881 by the ‘People’s Will’, however their act of violence did not trigger a general revolution.

Level 1 responses will assert the type of opposition to Alexander’s reforms. Level 2 responses will probably describe the liberal and radical opposition, but struggle with the forces of conservatism. At Level 3, the range of evidence will be more secure about conservative opposition, but there will probably be more focus on radical and liberal groups. At Level 4 answers will be balanced, with clear links to the nature of Alexander II’s reforms. Level 5 responses will have a clear and strong line of argument, supported by well selected evidence.

OPTION C: The unification of Germany, 1848–1871**Question 8**

‘The actions of Friedrich Wilhelm, King of Prussia, rather than divisions among the revolutionaries, ensured the failure of the 1848–1849 revolutions in the German States.’

To what extent do you agree with this view? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content**The Actions of Friedrich Wilhelm**

Friedrich Wilhelm’s action of refusing to accept the crown of Germany offered by the Frankfurt Parliament (March 1849) sealed the failure of the 1848–1849 revolutions in the German states. The Frankfurt Parliament had failed to find a national figure to become the leader of their vision of a united Germany. However, Friedrich Wilhelm’s actions before this had important consequences on the course of the revolutions. In March 1848 he made concessions to the revolutionaries and thereby kept his throne and bought time for the forces of conservatism to regroup. By withdrawing the army from Berlin he was able to maintain its loyalty and keep it together as a counter-revolutionary force. Supported by the Junkers and the army Friedrich Wilhelm was then able to dismiss the Prussian Parliament through a coup d’état (December 1848) and dictate a constitution. Friedrich Wilhelm refused the crown of Germany, withdrew delegates from the Frankfurt Parliament and ordered Prussian troops to disperse the remainder of the Parliament now based at Stuttgart, thus drawing the revolutions to an end by June 1849.

Divisions within the revolutionaries

The revolutionaries were divided politically into radicals, moderates and conservatives. Created by a middle class franchise, the Frankfurt Parliament alienated the masses. Representatives of the Frankfurt Parliament were largely moderate and wanted a constitutional monarchy incorporating liberal ideals of limited democracy (e.g. the franchise, fiscal equality, freedom of the press, association and religion). A very small number of conservative representatives wanted to ensure that the Frankfurt Parliament maintained the rights of individual states and did not exercise too much centralised power. Radicals within the Parliament were in a minority but found their demands for a republic and the removal of existing governments at odds with the moderates. Divisions within the revolutionaries rendered the Frankfurt Parliament impotent and its failure to solve working-class problems led to the creation of independent workers’ assemblies who made economic demands against middle-class interests. They requested the limitation of factory production, restrictions on free economic and industrial growth and the protection of the artisan guilds.

Other Factors

The role of Van Gagern, the lack of an effective administration and military backup for the Frankfurt Parliament, the challenge of non-German nationalism, etc.

Level 1 responses will probably give an incomplete narrative of the course of the 1848-49 Revolutions in the German states. At Level 2, there will be some brief focus on the issues, but little understanding of the role of Friedrich Wilhelm. Level 3 answers will be more explicit in their focus of why the revolutions failed. At Level 4, responses will be balanced with perhaps a discussion on other reasons why the revolutions failed in Germany. Level 5 answers will have judgement, clearly identifying reasons for the failure of the Revolutions.

Question 9

To what extent were military and diplomatic factors more important than economic factors in bringing about German unification in the years 1862 to 1871? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The question looks at the main factors in the unification of Germany and candidates have to judge which had the most significant impact. The argument that German unification was the ‘grand design’ of Bismarck the ‘master politician and supreme statesman’ is now out of favour and he is now considered to be a ‘clever opportunist’ who was able to exploit the diplomatic and political circumstances in Europe for his own political gain. Other historians emphasise the ‘primacy of economics’ and argue that Prussian diplomacy was founded upon the economic dynamic.

Military and Diplomatic Factors

Germany was unified through three victorious wars against the Danes (1864), Austrians (1866) and French (1870). Bismarck’s diplomacy was vital for the pretext of conflict and for the isolation of opponents and acquisition of supporters, e.g. Bismarck’s diplomacy isolated Austria following the Schleswig and Danish crises before the war with Prussia in 1866 which finally broke Austrian power in Germany and paved the way for a *kleindeutsch* solution to the German problem. However, the extent to which this diplomacy was pre-planned needs to be considered. Bismarck’s appointment in 1862 secured the approval of Von Roon’s army reforms in the Landtag. Von Moltke as Chief of General Staff was the architect of the Prussian victories and the key to his success was that he undertook significant reforms that recognised the importance of advances in technology and communications. For example, he exploited Prussia’s superior rail network and mobilised his forces in half the time of the Austrians whilst the development of the breech-loading rifle gave Prussian troops a crucial military advantage over the Austrian muzzle-loading musket. But is this an example of economic factors leading military developments which could be used to secure diplomacy?

Economic Factors

It can be argued that the swift development of the Prussian economy led to the creation of a *kleindeutsch* state because of the need to defend the economic advantage from Austria. Therefore Bismarck did not exploit the economic advantage but was swept along by it and the social forces that arose from industrial development. The rise of the Prussian military machine followed the expansion of the economy through the Zollverein and industrialisation (railways, coal, iron, steel, textiles, Rhineland/Ruhr resources and heavy industry). Candidates may legitimately argue that “coal and iron” was more important in the creation of a united Germany.

Level 1 responses may give an incomplete narrative on the unification of Germany. At Level 2, answers will have some descriptive focus on military/diplomatic and economic factors but very few explicit links between them. Level 3 answers will cover the range of factors with some secure supporting evidence. At Level 4 connections will be made and evidence will be secure over a range of factors. Level 5 responses will demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and judgment about the reasons for the unification of Germany with perhaps some reference to historiography.

Question 10

To what extent was the German Empire in 1871 divided by political, religious and economic issues? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The unification of Germany was the result of Prussia exerting its dominance over the other German States, not by the result of popular revolution. Therefore divisions existed within the newly united Empire, most notably political and religious. However, it is possible to argue that divisions evident in 1871 were superficial and that Prussian domination of the new empire ensured that any opposition was easily crushed by her superior economic, military and political strength.

Political Divisions

The new German Constitution preserved Prussian power because of its majority in the Bundesrat, and the Reichstag was denied executive power. The Prussian takeover was opposed, especially in the southern states. The separate kingdoms of Bavaria and Saxony feared for their survival in a Prussian dominated Germany. Left Liberals opposed Bismarck and his destruction of civil rights; for them Prussian nationalism had destroyed individualism.

Religious Divisions

This was a major weakness of the new empire. Catholics, represented by the Centre Party, (especially in Bavaria, Polish areas and the Rhineland), were a minority in a Protestant dominated state and suffered persecution (*Kulturkampf*). The small Jewish community was also regarded with hostility and suspicion.

Economic Divisions

Superficially Germany appeared economically united through the Zollverein. The Zollverein had laid the foundations for German industrialisation and the 20 years prior to unification had witnessed uninterrupted economic growth and urban growth. The growth of the railways (over 11500 km of track by 1860) ensured quick transportation of goods and communication between the states. Unification and the French indemnity encouraged an economic boom, while the newly-gained iron ore of Lorraine stimulated the growth of the heavy industries. However, there was an East/West divide, with the East of the new Empire dominated by the agricultural land of the Junkers, and the West by heavy industry.

Level 1 answers will assert divisions within the empire. At Level 2 candidates may be more secure about one of the three areas of division. Level 3 responses will have a good range of material across the issues with some evaluation of the weaknesses of the German Empire. Level responses will be balanced, with a secure range of evidence, and possibly some discrimination between the areas. At Level 5 candidates will demonstrate judgement about the divisions which faced the German Empire in 1871.

Alternative D: Revolution, Conservatism and Nationalism in Europe, 1789–1914

A2 Unit 6: The Crowd in the French Revolution, 1789–1794

Question 1

- (a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Assess the validity of the views in **Source A** about the importance of the Champ de Mars demonstration of July 1791. (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- | | | |
|-----|--|------|
| L1: | Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains. | 1-2 |
| L2: | Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge. | 3-5 |
| L3: | As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial. | 6-8 |
| L4: | Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. | 9-10 |

Indicative content

At Level 1 candidates will extract relevant content from the source, e.g. “purely political” and therefore not “control of bread”, “important stage in the development of the Parisian *sans-culottes*”. At Level 2 this source content will be related to own knowledge about the importance of the Champ de Mars demonstration, e.g. 50,000 Parisians attended the meeting organised by the Cordeliers Club to sign a petition demanding the removal of the King from power and for him to be put on trial. Answers which narrate the events prior to the massacre at the Champ de Mars will be Level 2 at most, as the question demands an understanding of the significance of the event, not causes. At Level 3, answers will become more analytical than descriptive and begin to challenge and support elements of the interpretation. Answers which refer to Rudé’s research into the social composition of the petitioners at the Champ de Mars and link this to his assertion in the source that the *sans-culottes* were beginning to “express their own social grievances in a political form” are clearly Level 3 and above. Answers may refer to motives for the revolutionary journées of 1789 and conclude that these were indeed driven by economic factors, a point supported by Williams. At Level 4 there will be clear challenges to Rudé’s interpretation about the *sans-culottes* “as a force in the Revolution”. Rees and Townson argue that it was not until the outbreak of the war that the *sans-culottes* broke free of bourgeois control as represented by the National Guard firing on the demonstrators at the Champ de Mars. Own knowledge could be used to demonstrate how the petitioners at the Champ de Mars were organised by the bourgeois leaders of the Cordeliers Club and thus the *sans-culottes* were expressing their wishes, not their own. However, the Champ de Mars was significant because it did see the division of the Third Estate into the radical and moderate groups, of which the former the *sans-culottes* became more dominant.

(b) Use **Source C** and your own knowledge.

How useful is **Source C** as evidence about the aims of the *sans-culottes* during the French Revolution? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. **9-10**

Indicative content

At Level 1 candidates will extract relevant information about the aims of the *sans-culottes*, e.g. they wanted the removal of food hoarders, nobles from the army, the fixing of prices, etc. At Level 2, basic statements about utility will be made, e.g. a primary source, limited because it only refers to the aims of the *sans-culottes* in September 1793, etc. At Level 3 and Level 4, the utility of the source will be explicit, developed and reasoned. The language and the demands made in this source are clearly representative of the more extreme fringes of the *sans-culotte* movement. Candidates who recognise that this extract was written by those *sans-culottes* who represented the Enragés are clearly Level 3 and above. The source content clearly states the Enragés beliefs that the Revolution had failed to make sufficient provision for economic equality, and that hoarders and speculators should be punished by death, (this is not mentioned in the source and can be viewed as a weakness in the evidence). They also believed in absolute equality, hence the demands for the removal of nobles, etc., and were engaged in the dechristianisation campaign (inferred through the source reference to “remove all priests”). The source does not clearly state the dechristianisation aims of some *sans-culottes*, led by Hébert; they aimed to remove the influence of the Church and religion in France. The extreme nature of the economic and social demands made in this source limits its utility as a tool for assessing the aims of more moderate *sans-culottes*, as does the time it was written. The source reflects the growing radical and extremist aims of the *sans-culottes* which were a product of the war and terror post 1792, and candidates who clearly understand this are worthy of Level 4.

(c) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

‘The *sans-culottes* were the dominant revolutionary force, whose successes far outweighed their failures.’

Assess the validity of this view about the influence of the *sans-culottes* on the Revolution in France in the years 1791 to 1794. (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

The key dates for this question are important. Evidence from the period 1789–1790 is not required and is background evidence only. 1791–1794 witnesses a decline, radical rise, and sharp fall in the revolutionary influence of the *sans-culottes*.

Evidence from the sources

Source A – “spring summer of 1791 ... as a force in the Revolution”, “express their own social grievances in a political form.” Therefore Rudé argues that 1791 is a turning point in the development of the *sans-culottes* as they had developed political aims which they wanted to be fulfilled.

Source B – “defenders of the revolution”, “cries for a republic”, impact of the storming of the Tuileries “sealed the King’s fate”. Therefore without the actions of the *sans-culottes* in

1791–1792, the downfall of the monarchy and the creation of a republic would not have been possible.

Source C – economic demands of the *Enragés*. Following this petition and the *journee* of 4-5 September 1793, the *armée révolutionnaire* was created and the Law of General Maximum was passed.

The Champ de Mars demonstration of 1791 (Source A) witnessed the temporary defeat of the popular movement and victory of the moderates, thus it appeared in 1791 that the *sans-culottes* were impotent as a revolutionary force. However, war from 1792 provoked the most radical phase of the Revolution leading to the fall of the monarchy (Source B). The Convention became a vehicle for the Jacobin dictatorship, which initially relied upon the popular movement of the *sans-culottes* for support (Source C). The *sans-culottes* were central in the following revolutionary episodes: the invasion of the Tuileries (June and August 1792), which changed the course of the Revolution and broke the King's power; the September Massacres (1792) began the Terror developed in 1793 by the Jacobins using the *sans-culottes* as allies; the *journee* of June 1793 removed the Girondins from the Convention and was supreme evidence for their revolutionary success. Following this the *sans-culottes* made political and economic demands that were passed by their Jacobin allies in the Convention, e.g. new Constitution, right to insurrection, conscription and price control, the *armée révolutionnaire* and the Law of Suspects. 1793 was the height of *sans-culotte* revolutionary influence and also the beginning of the decline. The war was being won and the CPS wanted to re-establish control of the government. The Jacobins cut their links with the crowd, weakened the Commune and dismantled provincial instruments of Terror. Robespierre removed extremists like Roux and Hébert. The *sans-culottes* lost their leaders and were unable to enforce their revolutionary aims such as a Maximum on prices. After 1793 the *sans-culottes* lost their ability to impose their will.

To secure Levels 4 and 5, answers must refer to historical interpretation. Rudé argued that the *sans-culottes* through “their constant intervention, had made an essential contribution” to the revolution. Furet and Richet argue strongly that the *sans-culottes* were no more than a minor prop to the Jacobin government during the period 1793 to 1794.

At Level 1 there will be short narratives about some *sans-culotte* actions. At Level 2, answers will describe in more detail the actions of the *sans-culottes*/or assert revolutionary force, with some brief links to the nature of the Revolution. At Level 3 the outcomes as well as actions of the *sans-culottes* will be addressed, if unbalanced. At Level 4 some evidence of specified reading will be evident about the historical debate about the success of the *sans-culottes* as a revolutionary force, with explicit and knowledgeable evaluation of success. At Level 5 evidence of historical interpretations will be clearly integrated into the argument with evidence from the sources and own knowledge, to evaluate the ability of the *sans-culottes* to control the revolutionary dynamic.