

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

9697 HISTORY

9697/13

Paper 1, maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

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

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	13

GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Examiners will assess which Level of Response best reflects most of the answer. An answer will not be required to demonstrate all of the descriptions in a particular Level to qualify for a Mark Band.

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
1	21–25	<i>The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material and ideas. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The best answers must be awarded 25 marks.</i>
2	18–20	<i>Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided.</i>
3	16–17	<i>Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and the factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.</i>
4	14–15	<i>Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively.</i>
5	11–13	<i>Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.</i>
6	8–10	<i>Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.</i>
7	0–7	<i>Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent.</i>

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	13

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

SOURCE-BASED QUESTION: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

‘Russia was the aggressor in 1914.’ Use Sources A–E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2–3]	EVALUATION [L4–5]	CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER [e.g. Contextual knowledge]
A	Letter from the German Chancellor to the Austrian Chancellor.	Russia would probably go to war if Austria took action against Serbia. Russian public opinion would be decisive.	Y–The source has merit as a description of Russian attitudes to Serbia. Y–Although a dictatorship, the Russian government had to take account of public opinion. Y–The analysis of the Triple Alliance has validity. N–It is one-sided, ignoring Russia’s attempts to secure peace and German–Austrian responsibility.	Y–B supports the view of a peaceful Russian policy. N–C, D and E give a variety reasons to condemn Russian policy.	Russia’s relations with Slav regions can be explained further. The nature of the Triple Alliance, including the role of Italy, can be developed.
B	Report from the German Ambassador to his Foreign Ministry.	Russia was conciliatory. It did not wish to humiliate Austria and was willing to accept limited punishment of Serbia for Sarajevo.	Y–Sazonov did favour peace. Y–Russia wished to balance fair treatment of Serbia with the avoidance of Austrian humiliation. N–It ignores the bottom line that Russia would defend Serbia in the event of war.	Y?– Sazonov’s claims that Russia’s relations with Germany had been friendly can be assessed, perhaps with reference to Bismarck’s policies. Y?–Russia’s attitude to Austria was not directly hostile but can be analysed.	Russia’s position towards post-Sarajevo negotiations can be expanded.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	13

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2–3]	EVALUATION [L4–5]	CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER [e.g. Contextual knowledge]
C	Germany's declaration of war on Russia.	Russia had rejected Germany's attempts to defuse the situation. This threatened Germany's security.	Y–Russian mobilisation was crucial in bringing about war. Y–Russia did not handle negotiation well. N–It is very one-sided and ignores German prompting of Austria to take a tough line, which was sure to alienate Russia.	Y–As in D, Russian mobilisation was crucial and endangered Germany's position. Y–Broad agreement with E. N–Disagreement with A and B.	Germany's claims about its attempted role as a peacemaker can be examined. The case that Germany was either aggressive or defensive before World War I can be assessed.
D	The views of a German post-war historian.	Russia had consistently pursued an expansionist policy. With its French ally, it had military advantages over Germany. Russian mobilisation was the most vital factor in the outbreak of war.	Y–Germany was in danger from a war on two fronts. Y–Russian mobilisation was decisive in the outbreak of war. Y?–The description of the balance of military power is probably accurate at one level but ignores the superior efficiency of the German (but not Austrian) military. N–It is extremely one-sided and ignores Russia's case.	Y–C agrees about the importance of Russian mobilisation. Y–E confirms Russia's expansionist tendencies. N–A and B contradict Russia's attitude to war and peace.	French policy towards Alsace-Lorraine can be discussed in the context of the hypothesis. Russian ambitions to take control of Turkish territories can be explained. Candidates can discuss why mobilisation was crucial.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	13

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2–3]	EVALUATION [L4–5]	CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER [e.g. Contextual knowledge]
E	The views of an American post-war historian.	The Franco–Russian alliance was based on offence rather than defence. Sarajevo was the Russian excuse for a war that she had long sought. Russia was one of three guilty partners.	Y–The chief aims of Russian and French policy are probably conveyed correctly. N–There were no immediate intentions by France and Russia to carry out these aims. N–Although a later and American view, the source is not objective but controversial, especially in 1926. N–The source ignores any counter argument.	Y–C agrees that Russia’s anti–German attitude endangered peace. Y–D supports the view about the advantage to Russia of the French alliance. Y–D supports the point about Russia’s Turkish ambitions. N–A and B contradict the interpretation of Russian policies.	The ‘order of guilt’ can be discussed. Russia’s willingness to engage in a general European war, rather than a localised conflict, can be assessed.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	13

1 Source-Based Question: Levels of Response

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

These answers write generally about the causes of the 1914 war but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information / evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss ‘Russia was the aggressor in 1914’ but will describe events very generally. Include in this level answers which use information taken from the sources but only in providing a summary of views expressed by the writers, rather than for testing the hypothesis. Alternatively, the sources might be ignored in a general essay answer.

L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE **OR** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6–8]

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation / interpretation in context.

For example, ‘Sources C, D and E agree that Russia was the aggressor in 1914. Source C states that Russia refused to cooperate with Germany’s attempts to settle the dispute in the Balkans. It declared a general mobilisation too abruptly. Source D agrees about Russia’s mobilisation. It also points to Russia’s long-term ambitions to weaken Turkey, which would destabilise the Balkans. It claims that Russia knew that it was better prepared for war than Germany. Source E sees the Russian alliance with France as offensive in nature. It was seeking an excuse to go to war.’

L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE **AND** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [9–13]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disconfirm it. However, sources are used only at face value.

For example, ‘On the other hand, Sources A and B interpret Russia’s motives as non-aggressive. Source A claims that Russia could not stand by the defeat of Serbia although this would probably lead to war. Source B emphasises Russia’s peaceful policies and states that Russia did not want to humiliate Austria and was willing to see Serbia punished mildly.’

L4 BY INTERPRETING / EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE **OR** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [14–16]

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

For example, ‘Russia was not the aggressor in 1914. Sources A and B provide good evidence for this view because both were written by Germans, who could be expected to be anti-Russian. Source B is a report of a conversation between the German Ambassador and a leading Russian but he says nothing to hint that he did not believe what he was being told. Source C is too one-sided to give a reliable account of Russia’s responsibility for the war. While one might expect Sources D and E to be more reliable, written with the benefit of hindsight, they are in fact very one-sided.’

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	13

L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [17–21]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example, (L4 plus) *‘The claim that Russia was the aggressor in 1914 can also be supported by an assessment of the sources. It is unlikely that the Russians in Sources A and B would be frank with German representatives about their aims. Sources D and E can be believed when they point to Russia’s long-term aims to expand into the Mediterranean which would certainly add to international tensions. Russian mobilisation in 1914 can be explained in terms of Russian military organisation but nevertheless it was the most important single step that led to war.’*

L6 AS L5, PLUS **EITHER** (a) EXPLAINS WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE / SUPPORT IS BETTER / PREFERRED, **OR** (b) RECONCILES / EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED [22–25]

For (a), the argument must be that the evidence for challenging or supporting the claim is more justified. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but why some evidence is worse.

For example, *‘All of the sources have limitations. None is neutral. However, the best overall extract is Source E. This has a wider range of discussion than Sources A, B and C and is to be preferred to Source D, which is clearly an attempt to acquit Germany of a charge of war guilt which led to the Versailles settlement.’*

OR

‘Taken together, Sources A and B make a strong case against the hypothesis that Russia was the aggressor in 1914. Source A is particularly convincing because it is a letter from the German Chancellor to the Austrian Chancellor. It might be expected that Bethmann Hollweg would be completely hostile to Russia but he sees Russia’s problems. This contrasts with Source C, the other German source, which is simply a justification for war with Russia.’

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

For example, *‘A modified and better hypothesis is that Russia was not the only aggressor in 1914. Of the major powers, Britain was the only one that did not see the advantage in going to war. The Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente were formed as defences against an attack, to avoid isolation. In fact, they linked groups of countries in agreements that were difficult to escape when there was a crisis such as that in the Balkans. Russia was an aggressor but so were Austria, France and Germany.’*

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	13

Section B

2 Why did it prove impossible to reform the ancien régime by 1789?

Louis XVI inherited a difficult situation and faced many problems which were deep-rooted. He was religious and took his role as monarch seriously. However, he lacked energy and commitment to the task of ruling France. Courtiers and relatives criticised him as weak and indecisive. He found it too easy to give in to reactionaries against the reforming policies of some ministers. The Queen, Marie Antoinette, was more determined but her great influence on her husband was badly directed. She opposed reform. Her lifestyle proved expensive and controversial. Turgot warned Louis XVI against intervention in the War of American Independence because of its cost. Necker tried to remedy the dire financial situation by heavy borrowing, but this made things worse. From 1783, Calonne attempted to remedy the situation by cutting expenditure and reforming the fiscal system. The political and social structure of France undermined his efforts. The King was more swayed by the difficulty of the task. The American war did prove costly. The fiscal system was inefficient. Large sums were diverted from the royal treasury to tax farmers and others. The burden of taxation was carried more by the middle classes and, proportionately, the peasantry than by the nobility and Church. The legislative and administrative systems were complex and obstructive. The *parlements* were preoccupied in their determination to protect their privileges. The revolt of the nobility in the late 1780s showed the power and negative aims of this group and the King's failure to rule effectively. The Assembly of Notables (1787) failed. A series of bad harvests added to the problems. Responses can discuss the events and significance of 1789, including the meeting of the Estates General, Bastille and Declaration of Rights, but should not go past this date.

3 How far was society industrialised by the middle of the nineteenth century? (You should refer to at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

By the middle of the nineteenth century much of Europe, including France and Germany, was still mostly pre-industrial. The 1851 Census showed that more people in Britain were living in towns than in rural areas. In pre-industrial societies, the largest proportion of people lived in small towns or villages. There were cities and these were much fewer and smaller than in the industrial age. Most of these towns and villages were self-sufficient. Trade was largely local. The combination of available food supplies and the effects of disease kept the size of the population reasonably stable. Industrialised towns were not self-sufficient. They depended on outside regions for food and other supplies. Improvements decreased the death rate so that populations increased in size. Social structures in pre-industrialised times were comparatively simple, dependent on the relationship between landowners and peasants. Labour in the pre-industrial period was mostly domestic, either working the land or processing wool etc. Factory labour in towns brought a very different social dimension but conditions in rural regions could be harsh. It is not true that industrialisation brought women's and children's labour for the first time. Many skilled jobs disappeared. Machines needed unskilled labour. It will be relevant to point out changing political features because they reflected a changing society. By about 1850, the British middle classes, but not the lower classes, enjoyed influence through the franchise. The struggle in France proved more violent while there was little change in a disunited Germany. Care should be taken when dealing with the social effects of railways. Britain saw some changes but they did not yet have the massive effect that they had in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	13

4 Why were foreign powers important to Bismarck’s unification of Germany by 1871?

Candidates might discuss how far the wars show Bismarck as a long-term planner, exploiting other countries, or an opportunist who took advantage of the mistakes of foreign statesmen. Answers can discuss the war with Denmark over Schleswig-Holstein (1864), the Austro-Prussian War (1866) and the Franco-Prussian War (1870–71). The Danish War enabled Bismarck to win support within Prussia and defeat the Liberals, winning the argument over the army budget. It was a test for the reformed Prussian army. It also won German support outside Prussia. The war showed Bismarck’s realism as he engaged Austria as an ally. Britain and France made ineffective protests. The war with Austria followed Bismarck’s proposal to exclude Austria from a new German Bund. The consequences for Prussian and Austrian power were clear. Bismarck again out-manoeuvred Napoleon III. He ensured the friendly neutrality of Russia by his attitude to the Polish revolt. He weakened Austria by an alliance with the new Italy which was promised Venetia. Britain was again neutral. Victory enabled Bismarck to set up the North German Confederation, dominated by Prussia. Some states were annexed to Prussia, others were in a federal system in which Prussia was the dominant power. It was partial unification and there are different views of Bismarck’s attitude to further unification, German states outside the NGC and France. From 1866, France became hostile to Bismarck’s plans. He revealed Napoleon III’s negotiations and demands before the Austrian war. These angered other German states. Candidates can be expected to deal with the immediate circumstances that led to war with France. The consequence was the complete unification of Germany and the proclamation of the new German empire in 1871 (at Versailles, another insult to France).

5 How far can ‘New Imperialism’ in the late-nineteenth century be explained by economic factors? (You should refer to at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

Candidates are directed to refer to at least two of three specified countries and to achieve the highest marks specific overseas references are required. Economic and other factors were closely linked and answers should attempt to differentiate between them. It will also be relevant to discuss other motives, such as Social Darwinism. A case can be made for the primacy of either factor. Candidates are not expected to be able to name historians but Hobson (then Lenin: ‘Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism’) argued the case for economic interests. Imperialism was promoted by the needs of industrialisation, to provide raw materials and markets for changing European economies. Surplus capital needed areas for investment. However, Britain invested heavily in north and south America as well as in Africa. Most French investment went to Russia and other parts of eastern Europe. There were also German investments in eastern Europe and Turkey. Some regions were colonised that promised limited or no economic benefits, for example African Sahara areas for France and small Pacific islands for Germany. However, economic issues did loom large in some places. Gold in South Africa was important while the search for profits in Asia was a salient feature of imperialism there. European countries were rivals to gain trading concessions in China. Discussion of political ambitions can refer to Britain’s view that extra-European influence was important to demonstrate that it enjoyed world power, contrasting with its limited regard for continental engagements. France would demonstrate its first class status and recovery from defeat by Prussia / Germany by creating a world empire. Germany under William II was keen to establish itself as a world power, particularly to match or overtake Britain. Examples can be given, such as Fashoda (1898), of how political interests could take European countries to the verge of war and changed the balance of power and alliances in Europe.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	13

6 Why was World War I such an important cause of the two Russian Revolutions in 1917?

War hastened the problems and decline that were already apparent in Russia but very extensive accounts of pre-war Russia would not be relevant. War exposed poor leadership and military organisation. Large sums had been spent on the army before the war but soon shortages of munitions and other supplies were apparent. Russia had ample soldiers but they were poorly trained and their officer class compared very badly with Germany's. Early victories against Austria were misleading. Nicholas II's highly personal position as Tsar exposed him to direct and widespread criticism, especially when he left Moscow and St. Petersburg for the front. He had no military talents while government was left to the unpopular and incompetent Tsarina Alexandra, and Rasputin. The Tsarina presided over a chaotic series of ministerial appointments and dismissals. Morale in Russia plummeted. Strikes became widespread as food was in short supply for the civilian population. Perhaps most vitally, there was dissent in the army, previously the rock of Tsarism. As many as half of the army were killed, wounded or captured. Desertions spread. A sudden, possibly unexpected, crisis occurred in February 1917, starting with street demonstrations. Troops refused to fire and the Tsar's abdication soon followed. The war remained a serious problem for Kerensky's Provisional Government. Demands for peace were widespread as were calls for policies and economic reforms. Kerensky was sympathetic but continued the war, probably to preserve Russia's honour and the funds paid by the allies. The July Days exposed the weakness of his position. Sailors and soldiers were heavily involved. In the short term, Lenin and the Bolsheviks suffered a setback but the Kornilov affair strengthened their position and further weakened Kerensky. 'Peace' was one of the slogans used effectively by Lenin to win power in October, along with 'Bread and Land'.

7 'Propaganda was Stalin's most important method of keeping power to 1939.' How far do you agree with this claim?

'How far..?' invites discussion and assessment of propaganda against other reasons. For instance the power structure in Russia and the way in which Stalin's personal position was strengthened by propaganda and his ability to make all appointments, directly or indirectly, could be considered. Statistics (often fabricated) were used to persuade Russians that life under Stalin was a success, whatever their personal hardships. Propaganda served three linked factors. Its focus on Stalin ensured his continuing power. It persuaded Russia that everything was prospering. It aimed to convince people that Terror was necessary to save the country from enemies of the state. The period of Terror can be interpreted as the mid and late 1930s but it is equally acceptable to take it from the death of Lenin in 1924. Stalin handled Trotsky unscrupulously. He concealed Terror in the early years by combining with other Bolsheviks, such as Kamenev, Zinoviev and Bukharin, to establish himself, then turned against them to destroy real or imaged rivals. The death of Kirov (1934) might well have been Stalin's work but it was used as an excuse to launch the most violent and extensive political purges. People from the highest to the lowest in government and administration were purged. Terror went beyond this. Skilled engineers and technicians were included. The officer class was decimated, perhaps because Stalin feared a reaction from the military as they had turned on Nicholas II in 1917. The secret police (NKVD) was not immune. Two chiefs, Yagoda and Yezhov, were executed. Terror was used against social and economic 'criminals', especially the kulaks and racial minorities. In all, millions were killed or sent to gulags: perhaps 20 million were arrested and 7 million killed. All of these developments were conveyed as necessary to safeguard Russia, not merely Stalin's position. The economy improved but the extent of the changes was exaggerated. Failures and hardships were represented as caused by saboteurs.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	13

8 Why did the French Revolution continue to have an influence on Europe during the period from 1789 to 1848?

Responses can be expected to make references to Britain, France, Germany and Italy (after 1815). The early years of the Revolution inspired some but the execution of Louis XVI did more to stiffen the resistance to change. The Terror horrified most of Europe and strengthened autocrats, even conservatives in Britain. The Revolution unleashed twenty years of war from the French revolutionary wars (1792–99) to Napoleon’s campaigns. In spite of his ultimate defeat, Napoleon made France a prominent military power in Europe. The balance of power was changed. Although the Congress of Vienna attempted to restore old Europe, the influence of the French Revolution continued as – perhaps ironically – liberalism grew. Nationalism was encouraged. The effects of the Revolution in Germany and Italy would be relevant. Although Napoleon exerted despotic power in Europe and was not interested in nationalism, his legacy saw him regarded as the promoter of the aspirations of nationalists. Candidates might point out that the revolutions of 1848 were caused by other factors, including economic distress. There were comparatively few republicans in France but the Revolution destabilised internal politics, for example in 1830.