

General Certificate of Education

History 5041

Alternative E Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825–1941

Mark Scheme

2006 examination – January 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 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's AS 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 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS 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.

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) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

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: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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 E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825–1941

AS Unit 1: Germany and Russia before the First World War, 1870–1914

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the significance of ‘peasant land hunger’ (line 4) in the context of growing discontent in the reign of Tsar Nicholas II. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. some reference to land shortages or rural poverty. 1

- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. describing the problem encountered by the Russian peasantry, who had no means of livelihood other than agriculture, but who lacked enough farm land to make an adequate living. With inadequate provision since emancipation and, by the reign of Nicholas II, fast population growth, sub-division of plots and an increasing tax burden, peasants remained on the brink of starvation. With crop failure and unrest after 1900, the peasantry began to show the potential for revolution. 2-3

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

Explain how the views in **Source B** differ from the views put forward in **Source A** about autocratic government in Tsarist Russia. (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, e.g. provides a basic contrast, identifying in Source A Nicholas II’s determination to uphold autocracy, whereas Tolstoy, in Source B, denounces autocracy as outdated. 1-2

- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge e.g. Source A, at the start of Nicholas’s reign, confirms his ‘divine right’ principles and blinkered attitude, failing to recognise the need for any political

change. Source B comments on the results of repression and associates autocracy with poverty and violence. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. as above, seeing Nicholas as completely out of touch – the Fundamental Laws of 1906 still described the Tsar as an autocrat. Source B sees autocracy as essentially redundant and implies the need for change to avoid escalating oppression, confrontation or perhaps revolt, although Tolstoy is clearly not typical as the conscience of the rich. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of Tsar Nicholas II's repressive policies, in relation to other factors, in causing revolution in Russia in 1905. *(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

From the sources, Source A provides a context for repression, with the unflinching attitude to power sharing of an out of touch Tsar. Source B provides a stronger repressive focus, and promotes the need for change in mainly political terms, but touches on religious persecution and economic impoverishment. Source C includes a broad range of issues, and provides the

basis of a response for candidates with many links – political repression, land, tax, industrial growth, economic slump and war.

From own knowledge, candidates should have little difficulty in providing a range of political, economic and social factors. With reference to repression, Nicholas II continued Alexander III's policies – e.g. emergency state powers and the use of the Okhrana, censorship and legal restraints, restrictions in education and the powers of the Zemstva, and repression towards national minorities through pogroms and Russification.

Candidates should comment on the lack of reform and the denial of political rights, with middle class agitation for power sharing; yet this issue was clearly not a major factor for the masses and the 1905 Revolution provided no key role for the emerging illegal political parties who were surprised by the unrest. The growing waves of unrest from the peasant majority resulted from economic factors – poverty, famine, taxation, redemption payments and land shortages, as well as the imposition of the Land Captains. Industrial workers reacted to bad living and working conditions with an increasing wave of strikes (with some political overtones). As well as these economic grievances, the non-Russian nationalities wanted greater autonomy and cultural and religious equality. The government and monarchy remained blinkered and inflexible. All these factors came to a head in 1905 with military and naval defeats in the Russo-Japanese War, and especially with 'Bloody Sunday' which provided the spark and catalyst for revolution.

Level 1 will provide only partial coverage or a limited summary. More range will be evident at Level 2, but responses may tend to describe the revolution itself, especially 'Bloody Sunday', rather than assess the causes. By Level 3, some source evidence must be included, with some explicit focus on the question. By the top of this level, a range of factors should be evident, but with limited balance or development. These should be evident at Level 4 with some clear attempt to prioritise the causes (e.g. long-term/ short-term, or economic rather than political for the majority), and perhaps commenting on the spontaneous and accidental nature of the Revolution. Level 5 might develop this sort of overview and reach conclusions.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by the 'a socialist state' in the context of the plans of the Social Democratic Party during Bismarck's regime. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. Bismarck's fear of a working-class party controlling the German state and economy. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. a state run for the benefit of all, not for the profit of individuals, involving the redistribution of wealth and political power, possibly in a Marxist classless society. Radical change perhaps brought about by violent revolution, and, as the source suggests, the ultimate challenge to the German monarchy, army and Junker aristocracy. Candidates might refer to socialist measures such as welfare. 2-3

- (b) Explain why political support for the Social Democratic Party increased during the 1870s. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. reference to the growth of an urban working class. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the election of 1877 confirms the increased support with the SPD gaining 12 seats, ½ million votes and 9% of the electorate, able to spread its message across Germany through the columns of 75 party newspapers. Rapid industrial development was creating a large and concentrated working class in many German cities which was receptive both to socialist doctrines and to trade union activity. Growth also resulted from the economic recession of the 1870s, with unemployment, fear of redundancy and wage cuts. The movement gained further momentum when two working class parties united in 1875 to form the SPD. **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. as Level 2, but effectively integrating the economic context of the 1870s with the broader themes of industrialisation and urbanisation or integrating the economic and political themes. Candidates might also put the relatively small-scale growth into perspective, and comment on the decline in support from 1878, following the initial impact of the anti-Socialist Laws. **6-7**

- (c) ‘For 20 years, Bismarck successfully controlled the political parties in the Reichstag.’ With reference to the years 1871 to 1890, 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 and 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

Candidates should present balanced assessments across a range of parties and across the 20-year period. At some point candidates might also make reference to the constitutional context in Germany, with strong executive control and relatively limited powers in the Reichstag. In the 1870s, Bismarck formed a successful coalition with the National Liberals in a political marriage of convenience, and his political realignment in 1878-79 was equally successful as the Liberals were effectively discarded. Less impressive was Bismarck's handling of the *Kulturkampf* – repressive measures against Catholics and the Centre Party were unsuccessful and had to be reversed. In 1878, with problems over tariffs and the Liberals, and the perceived threat of socialism, Bismarck looked for reconciliation in the change of Pope. This was more of a political retreat than successful control. Bismarck's response to the growth of the SPD was similarly misdirected. The repressive Exceptional Laws revealed his needless obsession with the threat of socialism. He tried to outbid the socialists with welfare legislation, but this was the result of pressure not control. At best, he merely delayed the growth of the party. The prospect of new anti-socialist laws in 1890 led in part to his resignation, when Bismarck found himself politically isolated without support even from the Centre Party.

Level 1 responses will be restricted to a limited summary, tending to merely either agree or disagree. Level 2 responses will provide more range and should include some evidence on the three main parties for the top of this level, but descriptive narrative may dominate. Level 3 answers must make some explicit response to “successfully controlled” and might make some reference to the constitutional context. At Level 4, the analysis should be balanced and developed, e.g. highlighting Bismarck's constant attempts to compromise and realign as he tried to respond to events. Conclusions at Level 5 might debate whether conciliation rather than confrontation would have been more successful, given Bismarck's constitutional vulnerability in 1890.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by ‘Triple Entente’ in the context of Russian foreign policy. **(3 marks)**

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. agreements made between Russia, France and Britain. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. comprising 3 separate agreements, distinguishing between the military commitment in the full-scale alliance signed by Russia and France, and Britain's colonial-based agreements with France

and Russia. Candidates might follow up the source lead and relate to the Triple Alliance. 2-3

- (b) Explain why Russia pursued an expansionist policy in the Balkans after 1905. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. reference to territorial gain and developing trade. 1-2

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. defeat by Japan in 1905 redirected Russian foreign policy back to Europe and the Balkans, with the focus now on Serbia rather than Bulgaria. There were still the long established religious and racial aspirations of Pan-Slavism, as Russia posed as protector of the Christian peoples as a pretext to extend her territorial influence; there were also economic and strategic motives, aiming to gain control of Constantinople and access from the Black Sea to ‘warm water’ ports, as most of Russia’s trade was now shipped through the Straits. Foreign policy also raised status and prestige, and distracted from domestic problems. 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. as Level 2, but is able to develop the specific context after 1905 beyond the more general motives for expansion in the Balkans. 6-7

- (c) ‘Alliances with other European powers brought little benefit to Russia.’
With reference to Russian foreign policy in the years 1890 to 1914, 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 and 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

Alliances with other European powers brought many benefits to Russia, with a virtual diplomatic revolution after 1890, following the earlier cold shoulder and increasing isolation from Bismarck's Germany. After Kaiser Wilhelm II declined to renew the Reinsurance Treaty in 1890, Russia now turned to France. The Franco-Russian Convention, signed in 1892 and confirmed in 1894, committed each partner to the military support of the other should it be at war with Germany. Their economic co-operation also brought them closer. France was the major foreign investor and supplier of loans to Russia during her industrial take-off in the 1890s. Russia's agreement with Britain in 1907 sorted out colonial loose ends in Persia, Tibet and Afghanistan. The Triple Entente held firm in 1914, and the three powers formed a war coalition.

However, the benefits for Russia from these alliances were clearly uneven and unpredictable. She received no support in the war against Japan, with her future partner, Britain, allied with the Japanese. Russia's weakness after her defeat led to tentative but ultimately abortive negotiations with Germany on the Baltic island of Bjorko. Significantly, Russia received no help from Britain and France in the Bosnian crisis of 1908-1909, and was forced to back down humiliated and embittered. During the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913, Britain negotiated with Germany rather than supporting Russia. In 1914, Britain and France went to war for other reasons than to support Russia.

Level 1 responses may be a restricted summary, perhaps concentrating on the Franco-Russian Alliance or on the Triple Entente. Level 2 answers will have more but not full range over the period, but may tend to describe events with limited analytical links. By Level 3, there must be some explicit focus on 'benefit' but perhaps merely presenting a one-sided verdict. Level 4 responses should show signs of development, providing a more balanced assessment. Level 5 responses should provide an overview and reach some conclusions.