

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2011 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9697 HISTORY

9697/11

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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	11

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	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.
2	18–20	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.
3	16–17	Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.
4	14–15	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.
5	11–13	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.
6	8–10	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.
7	0–7	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. Marks at the bottom of this Band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answers usually make at least a few valid points.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	11

Section A: The Origins of World War I, 1870–1914

SOURCE-BASED QUESTION: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

'The Triple Entente was a serious threat to peace before World War I.' 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	An article by a leading German military officer and planner.	The Triple Entente plans a co-ordinated attack on Germany and Austria, severely endangering peace.	Y – Germany did fear the Triple Entente. N – The tone of the source is extreme. This detracts from its reliability. N – There was not a concerted plan for an attack by the Triple Entente countries.	Y – B agrees. Y – D mostly agrees but does not mention Britain. N – Russia is not ready for war in 1914 although it envisages war later. N – E claims that there is not a military aspect to the Triple Entente because Britain does not have such commitments.	N – The accusation of plans for a co-ordinated attack is an exaggeration. Y – The prediction of widespread destruction proved correct (but after 1914 when the topic ends).
B	A memorandum by an important Austrian military official to his government.	Serbia and Romania are Austria's most dangerous enemies, but neither was a member of the Triple Entente. The Triple Entente has various advantages over Austria and its allies in the Triple Alliance.	Y – Some of the claims about the support for the Triple Entente are correct. Y – Germany and Austria feared being at a disadvantage. N – Serbia and Romania, not the Triple Entente countries, were Austria's most dangerous enemies. N – Austria was hostile to the Triple Entente; the reliability of the source is questionable.	Y – A agrees. Y – C agrees that the Triple Alliance is becoming weaker while Russia becomes stronger. Y – Russia, supported by France, plans action against Germany. N – E states that there is not a militarily co-ordinated Triple Entente. N – The most dangerous states are Serbia and Romania.	Y – The membership of the rival alliances is described quite accurately. N – The extent of cooperation between the alleged members of the Triple Entente is exaggerated.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	11

C	A report by an important German police official to an ambassador.	Although there is danger from the quarrel between Austria and Serbia and the Triple Alliance is becoming weaker, Britain, France and Russia do not want war at this time. Britain wants a balance of power. Russia is planning for war in the future.	Y – Some Germans wanted a limited conflict in the Balkans involving only Austria and Serbia. Y – There was some unrest in Russia but other Russians believed their country unready for war. Y – Russia was becoming stronger militarily. Y – Germany, especially in the Triple Alliance, feared it was becoming weaker. Y – Britain favoured a balance of power with neither alliance dominating. Y – The source is quite even-handed, giving it some reliability. N – The source ignores German and Austrian pro-war sentiment.	Y – A and B agree about the threat from the Triple Entente. Y – B agrees that the Triple Alliance is weaker than the Triple Entente. Y – Russia is responsible for the crisis, backed by France. N – D says that Russia plans immediate action. N – E shows Britain's position as wanting a balance of power. N – Britain does not see it is in a military alliance with France and Russia.	Y – The military condition of Russia is described quite accurately. Y – Britain tried to be even-handed while still pro-France. N – Russian opinion was more volatile than described.
D	A letter from the German Chief of Military Staff to his Chancellor.	Russia and France plan action against Germany. Britain is not mentioned. Russia intends that Germany will take the blame for war.	Y – Germany would feel forced to mobilise if Russia mobilised first. Y – Russia did not bring about the immediate circumstances of the crisis. Y/N – The degree of common planning by France and Russia is unclear. N – Britain, the third member of the Triple Entente is not mentioned. N – The source is very one-sided, limiting its reliability.	Y – Russia and France are seen as dangers in A, B and C. N – Britain is not mentioned so not all countries in the Triple Entente are involved.	Y – Russian mobilisation was a vital factor in causing hostilities. N – Russia did not originate the crisis, which began in Serbia / the Balkans.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	11

E	Speech by the British Foreign Secretary to Parliament.	Britain seeks peace, as does France. Britain is not part of the Franco-Russian alliance but only has ties of friendship with France (so there is not an effective Triple Entente). An MP calls out that Britain is also a friend of Germany.	N – Britain worked for peace. N – Grey denied the existence of a military alliance with France and Russia. Y/N – Britain's stance if war breaks out is not clear. Y/N – Grey did try to ensure peace but his stance lacked clarity.	Y – B agrees that the crisis began between Austria and Serbia. N – Disagrees with A and B that there was a, co-ordinated military plan by the Triple Entente. Y/N – Grey did not make Britain's policies clear.	Y – Britain had tried to mediate. Y – The crisis did begin with the dispute between Austria and Serbia. Y/N – The military implications of the Triple Entente were unclear before World War I broke out. N – The MP's intervention reflected the pro-German feelings of some in Britain.
---	--	--	--	---	---

NB: These responses indicate only one way to analyse and evaluate the passages. Alternative arguments can be proposed, as long as they are soundly based.

Key: Y & N, i.e. the source supports or challenges the hypothesis.

1 Source-Based Question

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

These answers write generally about the causes of World War I but will ignore the key issues in the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information / evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss *'The Triple Entente was a serious threat to peace before World War I.'* but might make only general points about the causes of the war. 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.

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, *'The claim that the Triple Entente was a serious threat to peace before World War I is justified. Source A shows the way in which the Triple Entente planned a co-ordinated attack on Germany and Austria, the most important countries in the Triple Alliance. Source B claims that the Triple Entente is superior in military terms. Germany and Austria were surrounded by a group of enemies. Source D confirms that Russia was responsible for the tensions, planning to put the blame for war on Germany, and was assisted by France.'*

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	11

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

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

For example, *'There is evidence for and against the claim that The Triple Entente was a serious threat to peace before World War I. [In addition to L2], Source C doubted that Russia wanted to go to war in 1914, although it had plans for war later. In 1914, Russia was even friendly towards Germany to some extent. France and Britain, the other members of the Triple Entente, did not favour war. Britain preferred a balance of power to the defeat of Germany and Austria. Source E does not confirm that Britain had close military alliances with France and Russia. To some extent, this is agreed in Source D. While France and Russia are anti-Germany, the extract does not mention Britain and so the Triple Entente was not involved.'*

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, *'It is accurate to conclude that the Triple Entente was not a serious threat to peace before World War I. Source B refers to several anti-Austrian countries that were not in the Triple Entente. Source C is a balanced account. One might expect the writer to be firmly against the Triple Entente but he is not convinced that the members of that alliance were determined to go to war in 1914. Source E is a fair reflection of British policy. It was not clear what Britain would do if war broke out, Britain did not feel necessarily bound by its agreements with France and Russia. It interpreted the Triple Entente as a loose grouping rather than as a tight military coalition.'*

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

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

For example, (L4 plus) *'...However, the sources can also be interpreted to show that the Triple Entente was a serious threat to peace before World War I. Although the tone and content of Source A is extreme, there were real fears in Germany and Austria that they were at a disadvantage. The German writer of Source D is also correct to point out the danger of Russian mobilisation. Germany supported Austria in the Serbian crisis but probably did not want an extended European war.'*

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	11

- 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, *'Although there is evidence in the sources both to challenge and support the claim that the Triple Entente was a serious threat to peace before World War I, the stronger argument is that the claim is untrue. None of the sources is completely reliable but only Sources A and B see Britain, France and Russia acting together in an aggressive Triple Entente. Source C differentiates between Russia on the one hand and Britain and France on the other. Not even Russia wanted an immediate war although it had long-term plans. Source D does not include Britain and points to a dual alliance between France and Russia, not a Triple Entente. Source E accurately reflects Britain's wish to defuse the tensions and its policy not to be tied to a continental European alliance.'*

OR

Although there is evidence in the sources both to challenge and support the claim that the Triple Entente was a serious threat to peace before World War I, neither alternative is to be preferred. The leaders of Germany and Austria believed the Triple Entente to be a threat, as is shown by Sources A, B and D. Together, the members of the Triple Entente represented a very strong military force and they surrounded Germany and Austria. Germany in particular felt in danger of being encircled. This geographical situation is seen particularly in Source B. On the other hand, the Triple Entente was not an efficient combination of powers pursuing the same policies. The policies and priorities of Britain, France and Russia showed differences. Britain's priority was to avoid continental commitments. France was focused on its opposition to Germany. Russia's most important concern was to protect Serbia from Austria.'

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, *'An alternative explanation is that a concentration on the Triple Entente is misleading. The members reacted to other pressures in different ways. There was some common planning but to a limited degree. The Triple Alliance was more a Dual Alliance because Italy was not fully committed to it in 1914. A greater danger to peace in the summer of 1914 was the alliance between Germany and Austria. However the most dangerous threat to peace was the instability in the Balkans. This caused war between Austria and Russia and therefore between their allies, Germany and France, with Britain joining when Germany invaded Belgium.'*

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	11

Section B

2 'His main aim was to keep himself in power.' How far do you agree with this view of Napoleon Bonaparte from 1799 to 1815?

The relevant period begins with Napoleon's appointment as First Consul in 1799. Candidates might well agree with the claim in the question but the answers in the highest band will consider alternatives, even if they are decided to be less important. For example, a counter-argument is that Napoleon sought to save the Revolution. Answers can discuss both domestic and foreign policies but these should be linked to his aims. The Consulate, followed by the Empire, strengthened Napoleon's authority. He enforced his authority through appointed, not elected, officials (officials who were elected had few powers) and a police system under Fouché suppressed critics of the regime. The Napoleonic Code introduced significant reforms, populist to some extent. They included equality before the law, confirmation of the end of privilege and of land transfers, and religious toleration. Other aspects, such as marriage law, provided order. They made Napoleon popular. The Concordat (1801) ended a rift with the Papacy while maintaining some of the essential changes in the Revolution. It also gave Napoleon important powers over the Church. Economic policy that led to the Continental System was highly protectionist and intended to make France more able to support the costs of war. Foreign policy had several aims, including the defeat of foreign threats to France, but it was underpinned by Napoleon's continuing search for power. Some candidates might discuss only domestic policy and it is suggested that their answers might be awarded one band lower than would otherwise be awarded. Few are likely to discuss only foreign policy and their answers might well be weak, merely providing some narrative without focusing on aims. It might be difficult for such answers to achieve even a middle band although, as always, the quality of the argument will be paramount.

3 How far were Britain and France industrialised by the middle of the nineteenth century?

To achieve Band 5 will need a basic understanding of the effects on one country, probably Britain. However, even the best answers do not need to show an even balance between Britain and France. The question can be organised sequentially; it might be appropriate to provide a brief comparison in the conclusion but this is not necessary by the terms of the question. On the other hand, a comparative approach can be very effective. By 1850 (that is the 1851 census), most people in Britain lived in towns whereas the French population was still largely rural. Industrial development was confined to a few regions. This was not essentially different from Britain but Britain was smaller and the industrial regions were closer to each other. The population of Britain grew more rapidly and contributed to industrialisation. The French population also increased, but not to such an extent. The use of steam power was significant, first to drive machines and then in railways. Both France and Britain had railways by 1850 but the latter had more, over 6,000 miles by 1850 whereas France had about 2,000 miles. France was still building more canals in this period. The production of coal was more significant in Britain than France. The French economic system still protected agriculture, unlike in Britain. There were social changes, as France and particularly Britain had industrial middle and lower classes by the mid-nineteenth century. The development of shipping and overseas trade, for example in cotton, was a boost to British industrialisation.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	11

4 Explain the most serious problems that faced Italian nationalists in achieving unification from 1848 to 1870.

Good answers will reflect some knowledge and understanding of the whole period from 1848 to 1870, although not necessarily with equal assurance. Some of the problems remained the same but others changed. Therefore, it will be possible to organise answers chronologically and such answers can merit very high marks when developments are linked to arguments. More mundane narratives will tell the story but leave the explanation implicit at best. Nationalists faced many difficulties in 1848. Austrian strength was considerable and Austria controlled parts of Italy directly and other areas indirectly. Different groups, with different priorities, could not act together. For example, Manin in Venice fought for constitutional changes while grievances were often economic in the south, although there was also opposition to Ferdinand II's repressive rule in Naples. However, this sought to give power to the middle classes, not to all of the population. Indeed, the Neapolitan monarchy was fiercely defended by some of the peasantry. There was no national movement and no national leader. Austrian military strength proved decisive (e.g. Custoza) once Austria had put down uprisings elsewhere. Pius IX, the 'Liberal Pope' was deterred by the violence and became reactionary. He was helped by Napoleon III's France. Mazzini's programme for a united, secular, democratic Italy, achieved by Italians themselves proved to be a failure. Divided aims continued to be a problem for Italian nationalists. Cavour was prominent among those who favoured a stronger northern Italy under the leadership of Piedmont. Others favoured the unification of the entire peninsula but Rome, the historical centre, was a stumbling block because of the views of the Papacy. Some favoured a federal solution. The attitudes of foreign countries became crucial. Austria continued to see its best interests in the defeat of Italian nationalism but France offered hope for some nationalists. However, Napoleon III was uncertain until the late 1850s. After Cavour's death, there was a lack of leadership and disorder grew. Many resented Piedmont's dominance. Final unity depended on other countries, especially Prussia (Venetia in 1866 and Rome in 1870).

5 'Few Europeans gained anything from "New Imperialism" in the later nineteenth century.' How far do you agree with this claim? (You should refer to Britain and at least two other European countries in your answer.)

Answers in the highest bands should consider alternative explanations. The question asks candidates to refer to Britain and at least two other countries. This is to dissuade them from writing vague accounts. However, the focus is on Europe and examiners will not expect many details about the colonies. Some candidates are prone to confine themselves to the causes of imperial expansion in the later nineteenth century. It will be difficult to make this relevant unless the causes are linked to the consequences of gains and losses. For example, it might be argued briefly that there were hopes of economic benefits and then the extent of these benefits can be assessed. Raw materials became available and colonies were seen as fruitful centres of investment. However, parts of Africa provided little profit to France and Germany. Colonies did little to improve the general standard of living, although people in the middle and upper classes benefited from the import of luxury vegetables and fruit. There were hopes that the colonies could be an outlet for the impoverished, an escape from unemployment and social distress. However, very few emigrated to the regions involved in New Imperialism; more went to the USA, South America and, from Britain, to the white dominions. It might be argued that the general public gained from the feeling of well-being that resulted from the possession of large overseas empires. Certainly, imperial expansion was popular in Britain, France and Germany and public opinion could push governments into greater involvement than they would have wished. Italy might be suggested as an example of a country that gained little except for the dubious reputation of being imperial. Some might see the perceived gains from Social Darwinism as missionaries spread their messages. Some might discuss Belgium and the Belgian Congo, where the main beneficiary was Leopold II. On the other hand, international traders and manufacturers could do well and were able to insulate themselves from difficult trading conditions in Europe.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	11

6 Why did the Provisional Government win, and then lose, power in Russia in 1917?

Answers are expected to be reasonably balanced between the two elements. A 60:40 split either way can merit any mark, while 70:30 will probably deserve a mark one band lower than would otherwise be given. Some candidates might write long accounts of the background to 1917 with brief summaries of events in that year. Pre-1914 will be relevant but very unbalanced accounts might be limited to Band 5. However, the February Revolution cannot be explained without reference to previous events and developments. War from 1914 exposed the Tsarist regime to widespread criticism. The military situation worsened and the strength of the government depended heavily on support from, and respect for, the army. Nicholas II became more unpopular especially when he took personal responsibility for running the war. In his absence, the influence of the Tsarina Alexandra and Rasputin weakened the government. Extreme inflation affected all of the population. Instability was reflected in the quick succession of unstable ministries. Unorganised but effective protests and strikes broke out in February 1917. When the army could not (or would not) restore order, Nicholas II was persuaded to abdicate. The Provisional Government was a combination, hardly a coalition, of Liberals, Socialists and Independents. However, there was a parallel power structure in the Soviets which became more influential, for example with Order Number One which asserted control over soldiers. Kerensky had little power. The government was provisional in that decisions were postponed until elections would be followed by a Constituent Assembly. The underlying problems of the economy worsened. The decision to continue the war proved disastrous. Meanwhile, Lenin's Bolsheviks became more influential in spite of the July Days. Under Lenin and Trotsky they recovered and gained control of the most important Soviets in Moscow and Petrograd. The slogans of 'Land, Peace and Bread' and 'All power to the Soviets' proved irresistible. The October Revolution itself was a sudden coup rather than a widespread rising but the inability of the Provisional Government to retrieve the situation lost it power.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	11

7 How far had Germany become a totalitarian state by the end of 1934?

Candidates should note that 1934 is the end point of this question. Material about later years will not be relevant unless included briefly in a conclusion or introduction. Credit will be given when candidates discuss totalitarianism explicitly but an implicit understanding can still reach Band 1 if the rest of the argument and supporting knowledge is sound. The question asks 'How far...?' and the most successful answers will focus on analysis and assessment. The focus should be on the early period of Nazi government, but the question allows candidates to explain the background. The Weimar Republic was a democracy although one that was troubled by a number of issues. These can be explained briefly if it contributes to the argument. In the early 1920s, the Nazi Party was one of several small extreme groups that combined demands for socialist programmes with nationalist ideas. Hitler changed his approach after the failure of the Munich Putsch (1923) and sought to increase the electoral appeal of his party. This meant winning the support from the more prosperous, therefore socialist aspects of the party's programme were played down. It also made gains in rural areas where left-wing ideas had a limited appeal. From 1928, the Nazis made gains in elections, emphasising strong leadership and attacking popular targets but minimising its tendency to dictatorship. The left was divided. The centre groups were seen as inadequate. The large number of unemployed after 1929 became a fruitful recruiting factor for the Nazis while big business saw them as the preferred alternative to the communists. Small businessmen, often anti-Semitic, became supporters. A combination of propaganda and force (the SA) won Hitler support as the strong effective leader. Those, such as Papen, who helped Hitler to gain power democratically in 1932 miscalculated, believing that he would become a responsible and controllable Chancellor. The Reichstag Fire became a device to discredit opponents and establish single-party government. The Enabling Act was an important step. It allowed Hitler to issue laws personally and then change the constitution. (Credit should be given to candidates who point out that Enabling Laws were not new but had been used under the Weimar regime. The difference was the extent to which Hitler used them to establish totalitarian rule.) However, it can be argued that, while Hitler was a dictator by the end of 1934, his rule was not yet totalitarian. There were elements in Germany, for example the army and the economy, that did not fall under his control at that point.

8 Examine the claim that the Industrial Revolution was the most important cause of 'New Imperialism' in the later nineteenth century.

Some candidates might discuss generally the economic causes of imperial expansion but the most effective answers will focus particularly on the Industrial Revolution. However the question ('Examine the claim that...') invites candidates to put the Industrial Revolution alongside other factors. Answers that consider only the Industrial Revolution and completely ignore other factors might be liable to a ceiling of Band 3 although, as always, the quality of the argument will be paramount. Responses that deal only generally with economic factors and say nothing specifically about the Industrial Revolution might be limited to a ceiling of Band 4 with the same proviso about overall quality. The Industrial Revolution resulted in massive increases of production. Many countries had industrialised by the end of the nineteenth century and domestic markets were becoming saturated. European countries engaged in protectionism. Overseas expansion seemed a remedy for this, providing alternative markets. Machines needed raw materials and natural resources that might be available overseas. The lucrative gains from industrialisation might profitably be invested in new colonies. At the same time, the Industrial Revolution produced new means of transport, especially steam ships, which were vital to success in New Imperialism. Other causes of imperial expansion can be examined and it is possible for candidates to argue that these were more important. Strategic interests were involved. Colonies were seen as necessary for national power and prestige and competition developed to gain control of regions. Social reasons might be examined. The better answers, certainly those worth Band 3 should include examples of relevant overseas developments as well as convincing supporting knowledge of developments in the Industrial Revolution.