

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

**Pre-U Certificate**

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series**

**9769 HISTORY**

**9769/23**

Paper 2C (European History Outlines c. 1715–2000),  
maximum raw mark 90

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, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.*

## **Introduction**

- (a)** The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b)** Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c)** It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d)** Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e)** The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a ‘best-fit’ approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f)** In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Page 3	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
--------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

### **Band 1: 25–30**

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

### **Band 2: 19–24**

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

### **Band 3: 13–18**

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
--------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

#### **Band 4: 7–12**

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

#### **Band 5: 0–6**

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Page 5	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
--------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

### Section 1: c. 1715–c. 1774

#### **1 How effectively was France administered under Fleury and Orleans?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative/descriptive accounts of the work of the two men will not do well unless there is a very clear focus on the quality of their work and at least some implicit consideration of ‘effectiveness’. Factors which might be considered are – Orleans: Limited by Council; Degree of supremacy attained; Very difficult foreign situation cramped style; English treaty of 1716; Diplomatic success of 1719-21; Good administration in royal ‘vacuum’; Rise of parlement; Finance/Law; Role of Council. Fleury: The French ‘Walpole’; Above faction; No innovator; Avoided further Jansenism controversy; Period of repose; Supporter of legal work of d’Aguesseau and the fiscal work of Orry; Moderate foreign policy; 1738 Vienna Treaty.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Serious consideration of what might, or might not, be an ‘effective minister’ is looked for. With these criteria as a starting point a balanced analysis of the work on both men is looked for. Ideally coverage should be even, but some unevenness may feature as long the treatment shows no sign of superficiality.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 6	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
--------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

**2 ‘In spite of his failings, Charles VI proved to be an able ruler.’ Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of both reigns will not do well unless there is a very clear focus on the ability or otherwise of both monarchs. Factors which might be considered are – Charles VI: Personal establishment on the throne; Dealing with the Turkish menace; Hungary; Securing succession of daughter; War of the Polish succession; Loss of Naples and Sicily; Army work; Pragmatic Sanction; Development of Vienna; Overseas trade-failures there; Too many wars?

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Reflection on the criteria for an ‘able ruler’ is looked for. There are a variety of possible criteria, ranging from simple survival in difficult circumstances to leaving a quality legacy. Consideration of Charles’ failings is looked for, but it need not be a major part of the answer. What is looked for is a good and balanced/sympathetic overview of the work of the man in the context of his time.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 7	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
--------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

**3 To what extent was Frederick William I better at identifying and pursuing the best interests of Prussia than was Frederick II?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the two reigns will not get far unless there is a very clear indication that ‘best interests’ etc. are being considered. Factors which might be covered are –Frederick William I: Totalitarian; Noble primacy; Army; Organisational skills; Income/taxation; Guilds policy; Tolerance/immigration; Central administration; Prepared for meteoric rise of son; Wars; Neglect of education and law. Frederick II: No great change to essential feature of state; Man of action/militarist; Very ambitious for himself and country; Invasion of Silesia-hostility to Austria; Seven Years War; Over centralised-lack of devolved power/authority; Attempts to foster economic life of nation; Final isolation; Cost of war.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Clear identification of what might or might not be ‘the best interests’ of Prussia is looked for followed by a balanced review of the extent to which both adhered to this ‘view’. The ideal is even coverage, but some unevenness may feature as long as the coverage of one is not superficial.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

- 4 ‘Russia’s problems in the period to 1763 owed much to the legacy of Peter the Great.’ Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the period will not get far unless there is a very clear emphasis on problems arising out of the legacy of Peter the Great. Factors which might be considered are – The legacy itself; Social issues; Economic issues; Political issues; Administrative issues; Military factors; The church; The succession itself. Events: Boyar issues; Further succession problems; Individual problems of Catherine/Peter/ Anna; Faction fighting; Nationalist and German factors; Involvement of French diplomats in Russian foreign policy; The rise of Elizabeth; Highly erratic foreign policy; Financial chaos; Accession of Peter-another palace revolution.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Serious thinking about the ‘poisoned chalice’ element of the legacy is looked for. The focus should primarily be on what Peter left behind and not on what he did overall. The bulk of the essay should be looking at post – Peter events and analysing the extent to which he was responsible for what followed his death.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 9	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
--------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

## 5 How effectively was Spain ruled between c.1713 and 1777?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the reigns in this period are not what is looked for. There should be a genuine attempt to identify what the best interests of Spain were –for example– peace and internal reform in considering how effective Spain was ruled. Factors which might be considered are – Philip V and Elizabeth Farnese; Regaining diplomatic initiative; Recovery from bankruptcy; Managing a complex social structure; Dealing with powerful/over powerful church; Work on army/fleet/income; Centralisation and reforms of Alberoni/Ripperda; Ferdinand VI- Jesuit influenced; Balance of power failures; Development of empire and good relations with Portugal; Foreign policy and wars; Excellent work of Charles III; Enlightened despot; Ministers such as Aranda and Floridablanca; Council work; Expulsion of Jesuits/church-state relations; Yet Seven Years War losses.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Ideally there will be a ‘big picture’ given of Spain in the eighteenth century and a comparison of the work of the various monarchs. There needs to be at least adequate coverage of all involved.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

### Section 1: c. 1774–c. 1815

**6 ‘She had enormous ability, but lacked vision.’ Discuss this view of Catherine the Great.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the reign will not get far unless there is a clear focus on Catherine’s character/ability/lack of these and what might be perceived as her vision/lack of vision for Russia. Factors which might be considered are – Serfdom issues; Foreign trade; Agrarian poverty; Charter of 1785; Personal ascendency; Attitudes to French Revolution; Work with Senate and council; Hardworking; Legal reforms; The great communicator and great reformer; Actual seizure of power; Pugachev; Expansion-especially into Black Sea and Poland; Advantage of weak neighbours; Brilliant political operator; Took advantage of easy circumstances largely beyond her control?

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Evidence of thinking about her ability or otherwise is looked for. The ‘vision’ aspect may test candidates and material normally appearing in enlightened despot essays may well be relevant.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 11</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

- 7 ‘A ruler of great intentions but limited achievements.’ Discuss this view of the Emperor Joseph II.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of his work and the reign will not get far unless there is a very clear focus on both intentions and achievement. Factors which might be considered are – Personality-clever-neurotic-harsh-severe and rushed decisions; Despotic and obsessed with innovation; Over-ambitious projects; Just carried on the work of Maria Theresa?; Worked to create a unitary secular state; Belief in equality; Pro-war and acquisition; Wished to rationalise and centralise – but failed; Left Belgium and Hungary in revolt; Attacked traditional institutions; Out to improve the health and wellbeing of his people; Worked on self sufficient economy, Austrian dominance, united and unified administration; Belief in the rule of law; Good on church-state relations and the role of the church; Yet problems with Turkey and Poland?

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Analysis of both intentions and achievement is looked for. One might well be criticised and the other praised. Judgement which indicates awareness of the world in which he lived and ruled should be rewarded.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

## 8 To what extent was Louis XVI responsible for the crisis of 1789 in France?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Simple descriptions of the causes of the French Revolution will not get far. The focus should be very much on the crisis itself and lists of causes/historiography will have to show relevance. Factors which might be considered are – War; Debt; State of society and political institutions; Flawed governmental and constitutional set up; New ideas; Inequality; Church; Ministers; Expectation of Estates General; Population increase; Inflation/food prices; Wages/Harvests; Unrealistic expectations on King; Reforming aspirations; Rural and Parisian revolts; Management of events.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The focus of the analysis should be on the monarchy—as opposed to the monarch—and also on the crisis of 1789 and not on later events or general causes of the revolution. The ability to place one factor in a broad order is looked for, with valid reasons given for its place. There should be as precise an answer as possible to the ‘extent’ element for candidates to really get to grips with the question.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 13	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

## 9 How valid is the view that Napoleon was an enlightened despot?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the life and work of Napoleon should not get far unless there is a clear focus on what might be deemed either ‘enlightened’ or ‘despotic’. Factors which might be considered are – Military: Tactics and generalship; Lodi etc.; Nile and Egypt; Wagram; Developments in cavalry, artillery, infantry use; Austerlitz and Ulm–yet Russia and Spain; Waterloo campaign and obsession with UK; Naval failings. France: Broad ability; Careers open to talent; Civil Code; Concordat; Legion of Honour; Bank of France; Linked in with aspirations of bourgeois; Endless support of his own family; Berlin Decrees/Continental System– impact on trade and industry; Censorship and education Police state?

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The ideal answer has real balance in it. There are a large number of possible approaches – those who look at the ‘big picture’ on both sides and also those who narrow it down into a fairly detailed study of specific actions. Surveys of the military history are unlikely to do well unless there is a real focus on the nature and extent of his military prowess. Those who take a more ‘perspective’ view should also do well.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 14</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

**10 ‘The only real achievement of Alexander I of Russia was his role in the defeat of Napoleon.’ Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: his libertarian aspirations; his firming up of autocracy; his awareness of the fundamental failings of Russia; his legal codification; his attempts at constitutionalism; his ideas on education; his views on Poland and possibly his role at Vienna.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. It is unlikely that one specific point will dominate. Answers may agree with the proposition, but there is a case to be made the other way if the degree of awareness of the fundamental problems which Russia faced—such as the serfs and the dominance of the ‘old’ aristocracy is considered. Some reflection on what a ‘real’ achievement might be could lead to a more sympathetic view. Given his background and the state of both Russia and Europe at the time, simply survival could be seen as real achievement.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 15	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

### Section 3: Themes c. 1715–c. 1815

#### 11 How important a contribution to political, cultural and intellectual life did women make in the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present the response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Descriptive accounts of what women did or did not do are not required. Good coverage of two of the three areas is sufficient and flexibility should be shown to those who blend cultural and intellectual.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some idea of importance is looked for, and the greater the degree of assessment of the nature and extent of the contribution, the better.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 16</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

**12 ‘The Institution itself changed little, but attitudes to it changed radically in the course of the eighteenth century.’ Discuss this view of monarchy in this period.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Descriptive accounts of monarchs are unlikely to do well– the focus should be on the institution itself – broadly– and attitudes towards it. The range of possible factors which could be brought in is large – but might include – Locke; Montesquieu; Growth of absolutism; Divine right ideas and changes in them and attitudes to them; Waning influence of Bossuet; View of Encyclopaedists; Retention of roman law principles; Impact of minorities and the incompetent monarchs; French revolution; Enlightened despotism; Restorations in 1815.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Two issues need analysing. Whether the institution itself changed much and attitudes towards it. There is ample scope to debate and produce balanced arguments on both.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 17</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

### 13 Assess the political importance of the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The Enlightenment was characterised by a belief in human progress if human nature was given the freedom to follow its rational pursuit of happiness and that of others. Thus this impacted on political thought. The most influential political philosopher was probably John Locke (1632–1704). However, the French philosophes who considered the problems of society and advocated reforms based on reason had considerable political influence. Montesquieu (1688–1755) and his Persian Letters and ‘The Spirit of the Laws’ of 1748 offered a theory of checks and balances on government. Voltaire championed religious toleration and reform of abuses. The Encyclopaedists offered knowledge as an essential element in identifying abuses. Politically Rousseau ((1712–78) developed a contractual theory of government that was of profound political importance. French thinking influenced English utilitarian and reformist theory. Rationalist critiques influenced individuals urging rights for women – something that emerged strongly in the French Revolution.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There are many strains of Enlightenment thinking and it did influence monarchical reformism in the ‘Enlightened Despotism’ as well as underpinning movements for change in America and France. However, the extent of its influence and importance in comparison with grievances over taxation and finance may be disputed. It could be argued that undermining traditional ideas in church and state and offering critiques of traditional practices undermined the ancient regime, especially as it offered such attractions to the elites. On the other hand, it also boosted monarchical power if reforming monarchs used it to sweep away obstacles to change – for example in the enlightened despotism of Joseph II and Catherine the Great and perhaps Napoleon.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 18</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

#### 14 How significant was neoclassicism to European architectural development in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Better answers will go beyond an exposition of the elements of Classical style and will not be example-led. The significance may be seen in purely artistic terms as a development from baroque and a return to models of the past. Its significance may be seen in more general cultural terms as an expression of rationalism; or in political terms as symbolic of form and authority. There might be consideration of the Gothic revival as a reaction to it. Candidates are free to engage with different aspects of ‘significance’ and some may feel that there was a variation between the movement’s purely artistic significance and its political symbolism.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The revival of interest in the ancient world and the enormous influence of the villas of Palladio led to the domination of architecture by the classical style. From royal palaces and cathedrals the impressive lines and the link with powerful empires of the past led to a demand for classical mansions and palaces by the aristocracy. It had links to the rationalist movements in philosophy and represented ideas about reason and perfection of form. It proved a model for many public buildings throughout Europe to demonstrate a restrained and considered power in contradistinction to the excesses of baroque. Examples may be drawn from many countries, but Palladio is likely to be seen as a major influence.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 19</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

**15 Assess the view that population growth was the driving force behind economic and social change in the eighteenth century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Straightforward lists of statistics or causes of the industrial revolution may have some relevance, but they need to be closely related to the ‘driving’ force part of the question. Factors which may be mentioned are – The whole debate on the causes of the industrial revolution/s; Very different forces at work in different countries; Colonial stimulus; Fall in grain prices; Pre-conditions; Technological development; Impact of agricultural change; Nature and extent of demographic change; Transport revolution; Credit revolution; Commercial revolution; Unrestrained capitalism; Stimulus of war; Different social structure and social attitude to ‘trade’; Geography; Political attitudes. Population growth went from c 132 million in 1700 to 204 million in 1800.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Thinking about ‘driving force’ is needed; some may well see that as something quite different from ‘causes’. Inevitably there is scope for ‘cause and effect’ debates. Thorough coverage of both economic and social change is not to be insisted upon, but those who make a serious attempt at both and deal with the interconnection between the two should be appropriately rewarded.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 20</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

## 16 What best explains increasing imperial rivalries in the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Straightforward descriptions of the various rivalries are unlikely to get far. The following factors might be considered – Internal factors such as industrial development; Pressure politics– the ‘sugar/slave’ merchants; Desire for income and power; Mercantilist ideas; Need for food and resources– e.g. the Newfoundland fishery; Assumed links between empire and national welfare; The ‘Pitt system’; The growth of commercial companies; Wealth gained from colonies like India/W Indies; Scope for expanding population; Monopolism; Nationalism/jingoism/rivalry; Prevention– protect one’s own; Markets; Attitudes of statesmen.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A variety of factors needs to be examined in a good answer, with clear prioritisation and valid reasons to support. Inevitably there is no one answer expected, and different factors may well apply to different countries at different times.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 21	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

## Section 4: 1815–1862

### 17 What best explains the collapse of the Congress System by 1823?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Following the success of international cooperation in the defeat of Napoleon and the international agreements made at Vienna, there was the hope that the defence of peace and order or the status quo could be effected by international cooperation by the European monarchies. Austria, Britain, Prussia and Russia formed the Quadruple Alliance and agreed to maintain peace (the Concert of Europe). At the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818) France was permitted to join the alliance and the occupation ended. At Troppau there was discussion of the revolts in Iberia and Italy though Britain refused to intervene. At Laibach Austria and Russia were ready to suppress Italian revolts, but Castlereagh would not commit Britain. There was no consensus on the Greek Revolt. At Verona (1822) Britain objected to the use of French troops against Spain and left the discussions. The spectre of French domination of Spain was worse than the liberal constitutional revolution that Spain was undergoing.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The allied powers had their different aims and interests. Austria and Russia were more anxious to defend their multi-national empires by taking an active role against revolution. The interests of Britain did not lie in costly interventions or supporting absolutist monarchies. Neither Castlereagh nor Canning showed enthusiasm for supporting Metternich's active interventionism in matters in which Britain's direct interests were not involved. The alliance of European monarchies had been brought about by a common threat from France. After 1818 when that was officially ended as Louis XVIII's monarchy was reasonably stable and France rejoined the Concert of Europe, this was no longer a binding factor. The Congresses really represented the major powers of Europe and the interests of the opponents of liberalism and nationalism. This was under threat quite soon after the Congress of Vienna and interventionist plans could not command consensus. The Congress System even by 1823 was failing to come to terms with dynamic forces in Europe. Intervention raised the unwelcome prospect of extending the power of the monarchies which undertook it and creating opposition within the Concert of Europe. The Congress System did not develop strong military cooperation, staff talks, institutions or a common agenda. It was less a system than a series of conferences which became increasingly divided. Candidates should decide whether long-term failures to establish any real permanent structure or legal framework are more important than the failure to secure unanimity with Britain. A wider analysis is that it was not possible to 'put the clock back' after the French Revolution and Napoleon, and that the aims of Russia and Austria in particular were unrealistic. Also, national interests came before ideological aims.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 22</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

**18 ‘A backward-looking ruler who fought for a worn out ideal.’ Discuss this view of Nicholas I of Russia.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. In 1825 Nicholas crushed the Decembrist Revolt. His reign saw an expansion of internal repression with the Third Section of the Imperial Chancellery running a network of spies and informers. Internal autonomy within the Empire was reduced – Bessarabia in 1828 and Poland in 1830 were brought under direct control. Minister of Education Uvarov enforced orthodox beliefs in schools and universities. Devotion to the Orthodox Church, to the absolute power of the Tsar who stood for the nation was encouraged. Religious uniformity led to the suppression of Greek-Catholic churches in Ukraine and Belarus in 1839. The Tsar was influenced by the desire of Metternich to crush revolutionary nationalism and in 1831 he severely repressed a Polish revolt. He intervened against revolution in Hungary in 1848 and encouraged Prussia to restore the power of the King. He pursued Russia’s traditional interests in the Balkans in two wars against the Ottoman Empire and died in 1855 during the Crimean War, which demonstrated that Russia had become militarily outdated.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Nicholas’s adviser Count Suvorov articulated the concept of Official Nationality, which in turn became the official ideology of Nicholas’s Russia. It had three components: Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality. The official view was that Russia could only be maintained by strict autocracy sustained by religion. There was also a belief in ‘narodnost’ the spiritual uniqueness of the Russian spirit. The building of St Isaac’s and Christ the Saviour Cathedrals offered physical symbols of these ideas. Autocracy was demonstrated by massive military parades. Candidates may well see these relentless displays and the fervour with which opposition was crushed as evidence of the unyielding determination of the Tsar to promote ideals. The discussion could focus on whether they were ‘worn out’ and ‘backward-looking’. The association of absolutism with Russian nationalism marks Nicholas out as distinctive from the eighteenth century; he was not consistently backward-looking in matters of internal reform and his attitude to serfdom and the power of the Russian nobles and gentry could be seen as distinct from the ancien regime. Effective and absolute state power was a feature of later Russian history; but in terms of ideas and policies which seemed more ‘modern’ in his time, like liberalism and modern industry and communications, Nicholas seems somewhat outdated – something that was demonstrated in the Crimean War and addressed by his more forward-thinking successor.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 23</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

**19 ‘The 1848 revolutions failed because of the strength of the forces of reaction rather than the weaknesses and divisions of the revolutionaries.’ How far do you agree?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates should deal with more than one of the Revolutions and could include unrest in Prussia and Germany; in Austria and its Empire, Hungary and Italy especially. The revolution in France which overthrew Louis Philippe resulted in authoritarian rule and in Italy and Eastern Europe, traditional monarchical rule was re-established. The loyalty of regular armies to traditional authority was a major factor; the support from Nicholas I of Russia whose empire was not affected by major revolution and the diversity of aims between the revolutionaries and the failure, generally, to engage mass popular peasant support are usually seen as key factors.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The arguments about divisions might centre on the political apathy of the peasantry – for example in Italy where the Catholic countryside was influenced by the retreat from radical change shown by Pius IX. The lack of experience in managing parliaments was shown in Germany and the increasing divisions brought about in the middle class reformers by reactions to popular unrest in the cities resulted in splits and divisions. The unity brought about by the challenges to authority in 1848 did not last. The counter view is that, in the end, the military strength of the monarchs and the adherence of rural communities to traditional values, together with the ability of key figures to act decisively, for example, Radetsky made the power of the forces of reaction the key element. Without effective armed forces, even the most united of revolutionary movements might have found resistance impossible. However, no set answer is expected and candidates may exemplify their analyses in a variety of different ways.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 24</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

## 20 How genuinely united was Italy in the ten years after the Unification of 1861?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The creation of a united Italian kingdom in April 1861 came about through dramatic and unforeseen events – the Sicilian revolt, the expedition of Garibaldi and the decision of Cavour to invade the Papal States. It is significant that the King Victor Emmanuel took the title ‘Il’ not ‘I’ indicating his devotion primarily to Piedmont and not Italy. The kingdom of 1861 excluded Venetia, which was acquired through the war of 1866 and Rome, which was occupied when French troops withdrew in 1870. However there were still Italian-speaking areas outside the Kingdom, notably ‘Italia Irredenta’ – Trieste, Trentino and the South Tyrol and Dalmatia remained in Austrian control. The considerable civil war in the South in the 1860s shows resistance to the absorption of the old Kingdom of the Two Sicilies into a new Italy and generally Piedmontese institutions were imposed on the different regions. Traditional differences remained in terms of language and culture, but new unifying institutions were established.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Discussion may centre on different elements of unity – territorially there was greater unity by 1870 with the two great cities of Rome and Venice being added to the kingdom. There had been unification of institutions: there was a national monarchy, a national parliament, national laws, weights and measures and currency and national education. National politics were established and the serious conservative leaders that followed Cavour did work hard to establish the new nation. However, there were considerable indications of disunity: the South reacted like occupied territory and the ‘brigands’ war’ is a misnomer for the extent of resistance, often fuelled by priests unhappy about the opposition of the Pope to the new regime and the influence of the secular state on education and the religious houses. There was economic disunity between the regions, particularly between North and South; traditional loyalties and ‘states within states’ such as the criminal organizations of Naples and Sicily existed; linguistic barriers remained and Piedmontese politicians, soldiers and administrators dominated the new state.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 25</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

## 21 How well served was France by the rule of Napoleon III?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Napoleon was Emperor from 2 Dec 1852 to September 1870. The first phase of the Empire was politically authoritarian with opponents arrested and power centred on the Emperor and his government. A Liberal Empire developed after concessions made 1860–61 culminating in a Liberal ministry in 1869. The Empire saw greater industrialization, the expansion of banking and credit, more railways and the rebuilding of Paris. He pursued free trade policies, encouraged enterprise and invested in infrastructure even at the cost of budget deficits. At a time of general price rise and economic optimism, there was a boom in the establishment of companies and railways increased from 3,000 to 16,000 km in the 1850s. There was the development of larger transport companies and the growth of shipping. A French engineer built the Suez Canal. France's international prestige was boosted by the Crimean War 1854–6. France also defeated Austria in 1859, increasing her prestige as a supporter of nationalism, while gaining Nice and Savoy. However, Catholics in France objected to the loss of an independent papal regime in central Italy in 1861. Catholic opinion was alienated further by secularising education policies. Internal reforms were made in Algeria; the acquisition of French Indo-China in 1862 confirmed French overseas influence as a civilizing mission. Together with the joint expedition to China, the sending of a military mission to Japan in 1867 he opened up French influence in Asia. There was less success in Latin America with the failure of the bid to put a client ruler on the throne of Mexico. Plans for recognition of and influence over an independent Confederate republic floundered on Britain's opposition. The rise of Prussia with the successful war against Austria left France with reduced European influence and Napoleon failed to gain compensation. The Liberal reforms in France never had a chance to embed themselves as Napoleon III unwisely was drawn into a war against Prussia in 1870. An important element of the reign was the rebuilding of Paris. Napoleon III's desire to modernize Paris based on what he had seen of the modernizations of London during his exile in the 1840s. There was a lot of preservation work done on mediaeval buildings in France and France's railways were considerably developed. This helped the growth of coal and steel. Major banks were founded and the Bourse expanded. Napoleon was interested in economic development and offered reforms which recognised the interests of industry and industrial workers. The Cobden–Chevalier treaty marked a new departure and recognition of the importance of trade. In the end an over-ambitious foreign policy and the large-scale resources devoted to military spending undermined progress.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question is deliberately broad – better answers may draw a distinction between the 1850s and the 1860s, between political and economic development, or look at different interests. Some may see the regime developing towards meeting wider needs; other may see it trapped in adventurism with merely surface economic, social and political reforms. Some may see genuine desire for amelioration of living conditions and modernization, for example in Paris; other may see simply authoritarianism and an attempt to sustain the status quo.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

Page 26	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 27	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

### Section 5: 1862–1914

- 22 ‘Neither wise nor effective.’ Discuss this view of Bismarck’s foreign policy in the period 1871–90.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Bismarck’s priorities after 1871 were to isolate France and to protect a vulnerable new state without strong natural frontiers. He was anxious to avoid having to choose between Russia and Austria. The War Scare of 1873 showed the dangers of European hostility to the new state and the impossibility of preventing France becoming militarily stronger; but Bismarck was trapped by the decision to annex Alsace and Lorraine. This ensured hostility from France, so the only policy available was to ensure that France could not gain allies. The Dreikaiserbund was one way of doing this. Friendship with Russia and Austria would keep peace in the east – an area of no interest to Germany in terms of territorial expansion and its reactionary tone would set it apart from France. Britain might be alienated, but would be unlikely to join with France. Bismarck’s calculations were shaken by the emergence of hostility between Russia and Austria over the Eastern Question after 1875. He showed Germany’s new diplomatic prestige by hosting the Congress of Berlin, but his support for the Treaty of Berlin fatally alienated Russia who found that its consistent support for Bismarck had had no reward. Bismarck moved to a full alliance with Austria in 1879 and hoped to ‘square the circle,’ by also having a Reinsurance Treaty with Russia. The Dual Alliance of 1879 became Triple when Italy joined in 1882, seeming to strengthen the anti-French ‘system’ together with cooperation with Britain in the Mediterranean Agreements. By the late 1880s the complex network of Alliances was floundering – Russia had been alienated and the Reinsurance Treaty was unlikely to be renewed.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Admirers of Bismarck may point to the achievement of constructing and maintaining an anti-French diplomatic network; the ability to maintain links with Britain despite the hostility over German colonisation might be praised; the understanding that Germany was a ‘satisfied power’ with no ambitions for eastward expansion might be seen to be realistic and the Congress of Berlin might be seen as evidence for Germany’s new standing in the world. Alternatively, the decision to annex Alsace Lorraine might be seen as a major misjudgement which prevented any serious rapprochement with France; the War Scare might be seen as typical provocation by a restless and cynical statesman. The high profile in 1878 might be seen as hubris, leading to a fatal endorsement of a treaty which Russia saw as hostile. The Alliance of 1879 might be seen as ‘shackling Germany to a corpse’ and the dangerous policy of adding Italy might be seen as merely inviting France to construct a rival alliance system when the opportunity arose. The opportunity despite rather desperate attempts to avoid it was virtually certain to come from the late 1880s and provocations such as the Lombardverbot of 1888 made this more or less likely. Bismarck passed to his successors a ramshackle and unsustainable diplomatic situation. No set view is expected, but answers should explain why the policies have been seen as unwise and ineffective.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

Page 28	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 29</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

**23 To what extent, if at all, was the Russian monarchy more secure in 1914 than it had been in 1894?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The regime saw quite considerable economic growth in the period and there were reforms after 1905. The Revolution of 1905 was the most serious threat to the regime before 1917 but the support of the army ensured survival and the Tsar in the October manifesto and in the reforms in the countryside pursued by Stolypin did make some changes. The existence of Dumas, the emergence of political parties, the modernisation in cities and industry and the opportunity for more peasant proprietors and a decline in traditional communes, together with military and educational reforms may seem to suggest greater security. The rise in strikes, the Lena Goldfield massacre, the growth of the urban working class, the disappointment that greater liberalism did not result from 1905, the continued belief of the Tsar in autocracy, Russification and racialism might indicate the opposite.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is a well-established debate here; one view is that economic development might have brought modernization and greater stability if war had not intervened. The huge support for war in 1914 and the endurance of the Tsar's forces, together with the relatively weak opposition and the limited middle class might suggest that it was only the considerable hardship of war that brought downfall and that by 1914 there were major elements of stability. Against this, the on-going lack of judgement of the Tsar in not developing the Dumas, in relying on Alexandra and Rasputin and not supporting more perceptive ministers; the growth of the potential for revolution with the larger number of urban workers and the limited improvement in living standards and the growing political awareness of the fragility of Tsarist authority after 1905 may tilt the balance to inherent instability by 1914, fatally revealed by the strains of war.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 30	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

**24 How far did Wilhelmine Germany meet the needs of the German people between 1888 and 1914?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The regime encouraged nationalism, a belief in Germany's imperial destiny, pride in its armed forces and the creation of a navy and presided over considerable industrial growth. It developed the social policies initiated by Bismarck in the 1880s, but had repressive tendencies with police harassing left-wing agitation and military values spreading through education and the wider community. Instability in foreign affairs led to domestic agitation (the Daily Telegraph Affair) and by 1912 the SAPD which had become a virtual 'state within a state' became the largest party in the Reichstag. However, the basic system did not mean that it would share power and the power of representative assemblies remained limited. Economic growth had led to improvements in transport, urban development, cultural life and economic opportunities – but the concentration of economic power had led to a crisis of the Mittelstand that was to emerge as one of the major elements in the rise of Hitler, to increasing social divides and the belief in socialism and to some anti-Semitism. The nation was increasingly divided and the governments often ineffective. The Kaiser's dangerous personal diplomacy had increased the risks of encirclement and war, a prospect relished by many and supported by the nation in 1914.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Better answers may draw a distinction between different elements in the nation – the increase in naval building, in heavy industry, in large-scale cartels offered advantages to elites, but also employment opportunities and economic growth. Working conditions remained poor and there were problems with the growth of large-scale cities like Berlin. The growth of big unions and the SPD offered hope for many workers, but divided the nation – often physically with towns and cities having distinct working-class areas. Industrial growth also bolstered militarism and a belief that Germany's problems could be resolved by war. The middle classes felt squeezed between big business and the unions, but often found solace in national pride. There was often a distinction between Prussia and the states forced into union with it.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 31	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

**25 Was the Boulanger affair or the Dreyfus case the greater threat to the French Third Republic?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Boulanger was a politically ambitious army officer who as minister for war in 1886 offered the prospect of military success, revenge against Germany and uniting the monarchist right and army against policies which seemed to keep France weak. He was helped by government scandals and by memories of Bonaparte. He carried through army reforms to gain the support of the troops and a successful campaign in Indo-China earned him popularity as minister of war. He antagonised Bismarck in 1887 and won the affection of patriotic leagues and was particularly popular in Paris. Dismissed in 1888, he gathered funds and supporters and had a Boulangist group of deputies. Dismissed from the army, his popularity soared and there was the possibility in 1889 that he would lead a successful coup. Scandals and resentment about the lack of a strong revanchist policy had weakened the Republic, but in Carnot it found a strong president. Boulanger hesitated and dared not lead a takeover. His enemies turned against him and he fled from France, shooting himself on his mistress's grave in 1891. In 1894 a Jewish officer was tried and found guilty of spying for the Germans. The family of Alfred Dreyfus insisted on his innocence. In 1896 another officer was tried but in a biased hearing, the evidence was discounted. A public campaign in which the novelist Zola wrote the famous 'J'Accuse' article erupted in 1898. Dreyfus was brought back from Devil's Island and retried in 1899, but not entirely exonerated, merely pardoned. Not until 1906 was he reinstated. The case split France; the honour of the army was said to be a stake at a time when it was vital that France should be in position to wage a war of revenge. The case revealed considerable anti-Semitism which had built up in the wake of financial crisis. The left in general took up Dreyfus as a symbol of the oppression and injustice of the right. It weakened France's international reputation and led to anticlerical measures, as many right wing Catholics had condemned the campaign to free him and also to a purge of army officers. Vichy has been referred to as the revenge of the Dreyfusards.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Both Boulanger and Dreyfus revealed the considerable divisions in French society and the on-going importance of revenge for Alsace and Lorraine. Boulanger seemed to be a possible Napoleon – a dictator who might avenge the wrongs of 1871 and restore internal unity and respect abroad. Dreyfus again revealed the gulf between left and right – between monarchists, militarists, revanchists, the church and anti-Semites and republicans, organised labour, socialists, anti-clericals, intellectuals. Both threatened France's international standing and the possible support from Russia against Germany; both undermined the standing of the army; both were conducted against a background of scorn for aspects of political life. The strains of Dreyfus may have been greater as the object of right-wing support in Boulanger was patently unworthy to lead – but the issues of injustice and cover up by an army seemingly out of control and a church that had lost its moral compass were very divisive.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 32</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

**26 ‘Conflicts in the Balkans from 1908 to 1914 played the most important part in bringing about World War I.’ Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Russian and Austrian interests clashed in the Balkans. After 1905 Russia became more interested in the Balkans as her Far East policies had failed. The crisis of 1908 in which Austria jumped the gun by annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina without offering the Russians the support for opening the Straits led to a major international incident with Germany offering Austria support. Russia drew closer to France, who increased financial support. The Balkan Wars did not bring about direct confrontation but an enlarged Serbia was something that offered a threat to Austria and increased the danger of preventive war. The war against Bulgaria drove her into the Austrian sphere. The wars encouraged pan-Slavist sentiment in Russia and concerns about Austrian policy. The likelihood of further unrest in the Balkans led to an increase in tension and it was an incident in Bosnia in 1914 that sparked off the war between Austria and Serbia which Russia could not stand aside from; the support of Austria from Germany and the activation of support for Russia from France. As a war on two fronts required the implementation of military plans by Germany which involved an invasion of Belgium, this offered Britain a *casus belli*.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates may not see the Balkans as the main cause. The wars had been fought in 1912–13 without leading to a world war. The long-term instability of the Austrian Empire and its willingness to defend its decline by a gamble of military action may be the key. The gamble was only possible because there was at least a chance of German support and why that was given has to do with factors outside the Balkans – the build up of military power, the feeling of encirclement or the desire for expansion in the east. The willingness of France to go to war has little to do with the Balkans themselves and more to do with the build up of nationalist feeling the ongoing desire for revenge for 1871 and the belief that military power and enthusiasm could lead to victory. Britain had been keen to negotiate a settlement over the Balkans in 1912 and its concerns were about the hegemony of Europe, the need not to allow Germany to dominate northern France, its obligations to France, its fears of Germany and its concerns for Belgium.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 33	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

## Section 6 Themes c. 1815–1914

### 27 Did the *Ausgleich* of 1867 do more to strengthen or weaken the Austrian Empire?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. In 1867 Deak for the Magyars and Beust for the Habsburg government signed a compromise treaty in which Hungary would have local self-government with joint status with Austria and there would be common ministries of defence and foreign policy. This was ratified on 30 March 1867. Austria became Austria-Hungary. In practice, the expected cooperation for as renewal of conflict against Prussia did not come either in 1867 or in 1870. The immediate circumstances were the Austrian weakness after the defeat of 1866 and the danger that Magyar nationalism would be as powerful as Italian nationalism had seemed to be. A compromise joint monarchy might hold the empire together by making a concession to one of the strongest nationalities whose nobles could keep control of other nationalities within the Hungarian part of the Empire. In fact the Magyars proved oppressive and nationalities had to be protected. The influence of Hungary on foreign policy became important. The agreement encouraged other nationalities to press for similar status in the empire – the Czechs, for instance and then the South Slavs. Racial and ethnic problems were increased by Magyarisation.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The debate is whether in the circumstances of the situation of 1866–67 a firm alliance with a powerful and articulate national group was likely to strengthen the Empire, or weaken it by showing that concessions that had not been granted after 1848–49 were now a possibility and whether the Magyar influence added instability by creating tensions and by pushing the Austrian statesmen to greater involvement with South-East Europe and increasing the danger of war with Russia.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 34</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

**28 What best explains the growth of European overseas colonisation in the period 1815–1914?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The American war of Independence and the independence movement in Latin America restricted major formal colonial empires in the Americas. The growth of industry and the need for markets however encouraged colonialism in Africa and Asia. However, there were other factors. Colonies became a symbol of power and prestige beyond their intrinsic economic value. They also became part of rivalries between nations. New powers like Italy and Germany were keen for ‘a place in the Sun’; competition drove the so-called Scramble for Africa. The French interest in South-East Asia was not entirely driven by economic factors. A sense of civilising mission was also a driving force and local enthusiasts could pressure governments. One of the strongest reasons why countries competed for colonies was Nationalism and the power of ideas like Social Darwinism and also the move towards economic protectionism may be considered.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There were considerable developments within the period and the changes in the political geography of Europe in the mid-century, the rise of population, the development of popular nationalism expressed in a growing popular press; the availability of technology to develop colonial areas and increasing great power rivalry make it difficult to generalise. The development of steam ships and weapon technology meant that colonised peoples found resistance difficult, but inherent weakness in some areas, for instance China was a spur to conflict and well-equipped Europeans.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 35</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

## 29 Why was opera so important in the culture of nineteenth-century Europe?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. For all its Baroque origins, it was in the nineteenth century that opera flourished as a powerful and significant art form. The Romantic composers found it an outlet for a range of emotions that pure music lacked and it achieved political significance. Mozart and Handel offered villains and heroes but in the confines of opera seria conventions. The French Revolution unleashed emotions that Beethoven brought to new artistic heights in Fidelio. Here conjugal love overcomes political tyranny in a titanic way. High emotions appear too in the works of Weber, if not at this political level. However Weber's Der Freischütz reflects an interest in German folk culture that mirrors the development of German national feeling. However, it was in Italy that opera spoke for mass emotion. The more formal and conventional works of Bellini and Donizetti were overshadowed by the war emotions of Verdi's early works, often appealing directly to national feeling – as in the Hebrew slaves' music in Nabucco. Audiences were quick to associate exiled heroes and nations oppressed by cruel rulers with the state of Italy and Verdi became a national hero, suspected by the Austrian censors and by the Church. His dark and brooding pessimism actually stands some way from Mazzinian idealism, but he was a devoted nationalist and his Requiem pays tribute to Manzoni. For sheer controversy, Wagner reigned supreme, though. His works were steeped in Germanic lore and nationalism. His Ring cycle speaks the language of revolution and he was an active participant in politics – under sentence of death as a revolutionary in Dresden in 1849 and then causing huge political turmoil in Bavaria by the patronage afforded to him by Ludwig II. Opera was there to change the world and to renew humanity. It was 'the art of the future' not entertainment but revolution. Wagnerism became subsumed into post-1870 nationalism and later Nazism. The development of the European middle class demanded spectacle and comfortable and controllable emotions and got this from Massenet, Gounod and Puccini and the 'verismo' school. It could combine the visual arts – as in the superb stagings at Paris and Vienna; it used the developing technology of the modern symphony orchestra and the greater theatre developments – darkened auditoria and realistic acting. Its combinations of artistic excellence made it the luxury experience of the arts for an increasingly wide audience – the young and impoverished Hitler saw his beloved Wagner works from the gallery. It gained state subsidies on a scale that was unprecedented and its stars became popular heroes and heroines.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates could discuss its purely artistic significance; its significance in reflecting nationalism (in Prague, the operas of Smetana were virtual manifestos for Czech national feeling and Rimsky Korsakov was pan Slavism in Music); in politics and in reflecting changes in society. Better answers will use examples rather than offering example-led and descriptive responses.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 36</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

### 30 What best explains the growth of manufacturing industry in nineteenth-century Europe?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Industrial growth may be considered a result of the technology, begun in Britain and disseminated through Europe. The growth of European population offered markets; the availability of capital from a growing middle class and the development of banks; the free trade in some areas and the growth in trade. In some areas access to raw materials (for example Prussia) through territorial changes. In some areas such as Russia direct government intervention was more important than others. Railways often acted as a catalyst. Political developments such as German and Italian unification expanded markets; colonial growth offered some new sources of raw material; the growth of an international system of trade and payments offered world markets. Immigration from rural areas offered cheap labour.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Better answers might show discrimination between different parts of Europe, different periods and different factors rather than offering a sort of list of reasons. There should be an attempt to judge what ‘best’ explains by considering the relative importance of factors like capital, labour and technology.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 37	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

**31 ‘Women gained more than they lost from economic change in Europe between 1850 and 1914.’ Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Economic change would include urbanisation and industrialisation, mass production and in some areas greater agricultural diversity. In some countries this involved migration, particularly as it was accompanied by population growth. In Italy and Russia there was a high level of economic growth in the later part of the period which had considerable impact on the workforce. There was a growth in communications, for example railway development which impacted on women as workers and consumers. With economic change came social developments in literacy, in the range of economic opportunities, in political awareness, particularly in Germany. In more rural areas in Southeast Europe the degree and pace of change was less.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Gains might include more opportunities in a developing economy with greater tertiary sector growth. The development of retail trades, the need for secretaries, teachers; the opportunities in the growing cultural life brought about by towns and greater communications. The relative balance of town and country affected women and perhaps offered more chances for independent living. Economic development might be linked to greater educational opportunities, more social and political awareness, more consumer choice, better facilities within the home, more access to information. Emigration might be seen as offering a chance for new life and an escape from traditional and oppressive rural social norms. On the other hand, cheap factory labour in developing industrial economies brought hardships; living conditions in newly growing cities like Berlin or industrial parts of St. Petersburg, or Turin brought hardships, especially as women were often expected to continue their traditional roles as mothers and housekeepers. Burgeoning cities and industrial areas saw the growth of prostitution as population pressure fell on rural areas. Changes in agriculture often hit traditional staple farming. Better answers will consider different classes and different areas and offer clear exemplification for overviews of the benefits and losses of economic change.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 38</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

### 32 What best explains population growth in Europe in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The expanded food supply supported the growth in European population from 175 million to 435 million. This 130 per cent increase between 1800 and 1910 can be explained by improved mortality rates, changes in medical care, earlier marriages, and better sanitary conditions in urban areas. The number of people grew so rapidly in Europe that although 40 million Europeans emigrated throughout the world, the continent still showed a population increase in one century that was greater than that of the previous two thousand years. Much depended on Europe's ability to feed its growing population. To bring the increased food supply to the growing population, to distribute new resources to larger markets, Europeans built the most complete and far-reaching transportation and communication networks ever known. Without rapid and dependable transport and contact the Industrial Revolution could not have occurred, cities would not have grown, factories could not have functioned, and the new millions of Europeans would not have been fed. Thus population growth depended on sustained increases in transport and improvements in food production and distribution to defy Malthus's predictions of natural disasters resulting in a re-established balance between population and resources.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There may be a discussion about whether the reduction in death rate – with improved sanitation and the development of key advances like inoculation – and fewer large scale European wars – was more or less important than changes which brought an increase in birth rate – fertility, earlier marriage, changes in diet etc. Though industrialisation and towns offered more opportunity and possibly absorbed surplus rural population, population growth was just as rapid in predominantly rural regions and country. Better answers will offer a critical view of explanations and possibly be aware of differences in regions and different parts of the period.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 39	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

### Section 7: 1914–1945

- 33 ‘The decisive arena for the outcome of the First World War.’ Discuss this view of the Western Front.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The fighting on the Western Front was decisive in shaping the nature of the war in the early stages. It produced a costly stalemate and the failure of the March 1918 offensive was partly due to the failure of Germany to put in enough men – as a result of heavy losses in 1915–17. The final campaign by the Allies seems decisive. However, without the War at Sea there would have been no credit from the USA and no promise of vast new reserves of manpower – something that weighed heavily with Germany as her armies had not been decisively crushed, as in 1945. Also, without the peripheral theatres of war Germany could still have counted on allies as Britain and France counted on theirs. Russia played its part in depleting the reserves of the central powers and even victory there entailed keeping large forces in the East that were not available in the crucial last battles in 1918. The blockade of Germany also played a part in sapping the ability to resist, though this has been seen as exaggerated.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘Decisive’ is the key concept and long accounts of the Western Front which do not engage with its relative importance in bringing about the end of the war will not score highly. The contemporary view of generals like Haig was that the Germany land forces had to be destroyed and that ‘side shows’ like Gallipoli and the Middle East were irrelevant. This can be criticised as the fighting on the West failed to bring about in itself a decisive victory – it was more that Germany could see little chance of winning. To explain that may need a consideration of more theatres and to consider resources.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 40</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

**34 To what extent had Russia become a Marxist state by the time of the death of Lenin in 1924?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Between 1917 and 1924 the Bolshevik regime had struggled for survival. A minority who had come to power by a coup at a time of exceptional unrest, they relied more and more on terror during the Civil War. The initial ideological changes could not be enforced and there were painful compromises such as NEP necessary to safeguard power and the possibility of greater socialism. In Marxist theory there was a ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ as a transition from revolution to the true Marxist state and the Bolshevik terror could be seen as part of that. However, the unrest among the industrial workers cast doubt on whether this was a dictatorship of the proletariat or desperate attempts by a minority of ideologues to maintain power. Many of the measures did attempt to introduce socialism and there is an argument that Lenin was more than ‘a Red Tsar’ but the land Decree and the NEP had limited justification in pure Marxist terms.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. This does test understanding of the term ‘Marxist state’ and arguments should centre on this. The nationalization of banking and larger enterprises, the moves towards social equality, the mobilization of mass support against counter-revolution, theoretical respect for minorities and greater sexual equality could be seen as genuinely progressive. The repression and terror could be seen as a proletarian dictatorship; but there were few indications of the power of Party and State withering away and the increasing dictatorship of the leaders might seem to be a counter-indication that Russia had much genuine Marxism by 1924. No set view is expected.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 41</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

**35 ‘In the period 1919 to 1939, neither the Weimar Republic nor the Hitler state developed successful economic policies.’ Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Weimar faced considerable problems with inflation in the early 20s, but overcame them with the introduction of a new currency. There was economic prosperity in some sectors in the late 1920s, though on somewhat fragile foundations and Weimar policies have been criticised for excessive public spending and a failure to regulate banking as well as a reliance on US loans. The deflationary measures of Bruning were criticised at the time, but there were signs that Germany was emerging from depression by the time Hitler came to power even though unemployment was high. The Hitler regime reaped the benefit of this, though did work hard to reduce unemployment and boost foreign trade and payments under the new Plan. The aims were very different after 1933 with full employment and rearmament as priorities. These were generally achieved, but the New Plan relied on barter agreements and could not deliver the rapid rearmament demanded by Hitler after 1936. The Four-year Plan was more drastic, but there were problems with labour shortages and general economic overheating that were only resolved by war.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. It might be argued that in terms of achieving objectives, the Hitler regime was more successful, but also that there were limitations and weaknesses in the policies. It might be argued that Weimar seemed to be successful in the mid-1920s but was defeated by depression and pursued deflationary policies which helped to destroy it – or there may be defenders of economic orthodoxy and some sympathy with the desire to avoid inflation and to wait for an upswing. Much depends on considering what the regimes were attempting to achieve and making a judgement on that basis. No set answer is expected.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 42	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

### 36 To what extent did wars cause both the rise and the fall of fascism in Italy?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The war brought inflation, resentment about losses and disappointment with the outcome of the peace. It also brought a recurrence of pre-war social discontents with estate occupations and strikes. All this was a fertile breeding ground for revolutionary political ideas to the right and left, but much can be traced to the pre-war problems of Liberal Italy. The socialism that Mussolini stood against to gain elite support had been developing since the rapid economic growth of later nineteenth-century Italy. The inadequacy of trasformismo politics had been apparent before the First World War; problems in rural areas were exacerbated by war but not caused by war. The defeats in Greece and North Africa revealed the inadequacies of Mussolini's regime and the over-reliance on Hitler, already apparent in the 1930s, proved unpopular with people and with the elites who removed Mussolini. The roots of this, however, lie in the uneasy alliance that Fascism made with Church, King and army – the failure to bring about the more complete ideological state that Hitler introduced meant that Mussolini could be removed once the regime failed to deliver. The failures in war show the limitations of pre-war economic and military developments and perhaps a failure to inculcate true ideological devotion. In both rise and fall, war is central but has to be seen in a wider context.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. War is obviously a crucial element in Mussolini's rise and fall – but not the only factor. Italy had experienced political instability, military weakness and social and economic tensions before 1914. The war did give rise to Mussolini's paramilitary organization, but the ideas of fascism went back to pre-war days. Similarly, Italian military failures discredited his regime 1940–43 but also revealed longer-term structural weaknesses. No set answer is expected but there should be an attempt to balance the effects of war and other factors for higher marks.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 43</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

### 37 What best explains the extent of repression in Stalin's Russia?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The scale of repression accelerated in the 1930s, but the elements had been established in the 1920s with secret police, labour camps, and lack of adequate legal protection for those accused, show trials. The murder of Kirov led to a more widespread purge of party members and then a full scale terror under Yezhov and then Beria. During the war there was severe discipline to maintain resistance and after the war deportations and large-scale imprisonment and execution. There was every sign that a larger scale purge was likely before Stalin's death in 1953. Answers may focus on the 1930s, but repression was a feature throughout the Stalin period.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Explanations may derive from the background of Civil War, with Stalin repressing nationalities and an apparatus of Chekist terror having to be established and becoming engrained in the Soviet system. The isolation of Russia and the fears of counter-revolution and foreign hostility persisted into the 1920s. The scale of economic change after 1928 brought opposition and increased repression and the need for more forced labour. Stalin may have feared party hostility after the dislocations of the Collectivization. The alternative view is that pressure for repression of opposition came from below in the party, but this is not a widely-known revisionist view and would not necessarily be looked for here. The onset of war brought the need for total control and loyalty and brought about episodes such as the Katyn Massacre. As the cult of Stalin reached new heights any hints of opposition were insupportable – the collaboration of some Russians with the Nazis and the fear that prisoners of war had betrayed the regime increased repression and the Cold War confirmed the need for total control. Better answers may look at different periods and different reasons and offer some judgements about whether simple paranoia and desire for personal power is adequate.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 44</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

**38 How important was the war in the air in determining the outcome of the Second World War in Europe?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Air war in both theory and practice developed after 1918 and was thought to be going to a decisive element in the Second World War. Candidates should examine the increasingly heavy emphasis put by both sides on bombing economic resources – including people. The importance of gaining air superiority before large scale attacks e.g. the Blitzkrieg assaults, or the allied invasions of Italy and France should be considered. The importance of supporting naval actions with aircraft and the important use of air borne torpedoes at Taranto. Could show the importance of air power in operations involving the navy. The German failure to gain air superiority over Britain in 1940 may have been the turning point of the war. The erosion of German resources by unprecedented bombing could be discussed. The coordination of air, land and sea power was important from 1944 onwards.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Whether or not air power did play the role its enthusiasts imagined is debatable, but at certain key times it made a huge impact on the course and outcome of the war. With Britain still in the war, the Germans faced a two front conflict and Hitler's decision to go into Russia without having brought the western front to a resolution has been seen as the single most important factor in the eventual outcome. Air power was a major element in this. The loss of air support could be fatal – as for instance at Stalingrad and at D Day. The bombing strategies are open to question and their impact on the final outcome remains a debated issue. In the end the German forces had to be ground down by the sheer weight of sustained infantry attacks supported by air power but whether air power was decisive needs careful discussion. No set answer is expected.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 45	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

## Section 8: 1945–2000

### 39 To what extent did the USSR benefit from Khrushchev's policies?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. After Stalin's death in 1953 Khrushchev emerged as leader, outmanoeuvring his rivals. The Secret Speech of 1956 changed the political atmosphere, but though the Stalin regime was renounced and there were attempts at decentralization, Khrushchev remained wedded to large-scale state projects, such as the Virgin land scheme. The commanding heights of the economy remained in state hands and despite the admittance of the large scale crimes of Stalin and the willingness to accept this, there was limited political liberty and dissidents were prosecuted. Though there were impressive technological feats such as Sputnik and the development of new Soviet planes, the countryside remained neglected and protests about shortages and poor living standards were repressed severely. However, the image of rapid progress – the first man and then the first women in space, the impressive displays of military strength made many in the West think that Russia was a massive superpower. Khrushchev may have believed in his own propaganda and a dangerous strategy over Cuba weakened his domestic position.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Modernization in economic terms and the break with the political past may seem to indicate that Khrushchev ruled Russia well; but the limitations of change and the misjudgement of key economic policies, together with the continuing repression of discontent and the failure to address some key economic problems and to keep up the consumer technology of the West may be discussed.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 46</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

**40 To what extent can post-war political stability in West Germany be explained by economic prosperity?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The establishment of West Germany from the three Western occupation zones was accompanied by Western aid under the Marshall Plan. The economic prosperity brought about the Korean War and the development of the West German economic miracle prevented the economic distress that had so weakened Weimar. It made the consumerism of the West stand out in stark contrast to the East and helped to bolster a sense of identity and pride. The embourgeoisement helped to end the class divides and hostility of the pre–Hitler period and reduced support for both left and right, allowing the CDU to dominate coalitions and to bring about political stability. When the SPD did re-emerge it was to accept the liberal capitalism which had brought prosperity. Other factors include the leadership of Adenauer and his successors, the constitutional arrangements and the Basic Law; the de–Nazification programme and the association of Communism with an increasingly unpopular Eastern bloc which divided Berlin. Democratic politics this time got support from the western democracies. Foreign aid and a foreign policy which encouraged integration into international organizations which bolstered democracy (NATO and the EC) are important explanations. Adenauer's rejection of unity allowed West Germany to develop its own political character.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well–considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There should be some estimation of the relative importance of purely economic factors. Some may see this as the bedrock that Weimar did not have; some may see the decimation of the pre–war aristocracy and the greater social equality brought by aspects of Nazism and common wartime suffering as leading to the social change by which a large middle class could underpin the Federal Republic.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 47	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

#### 41 To what extent was the Cold War purely driven by ideology?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The period after 1945 saw the imposition of Russian power over large areas of Eastern Europe and corresponding opposition to the spread of Communist ideas from the West. There was a commitment to rival ideologies on the surface, but candidates could discuss whether Stalin and his successors were driven more by the security needs of the USSR after two world wars had seen invasions. Then there are views that Russia was reasserting traditional territorial claims and whether the West was considering its strategic position. The USSR accused the West of ‘dollar diplomacy’ and seeking markets for its consumer capitalism.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Better answers will be aware of the case for an ideological conflict with its origins in the Western opposition to the Russian Revolution, but will offer an informed judgement about the relative importance of ideological, economic and strategic explanations as well as considering the interpretation based on the real fears for security shown on both sides.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 48</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

## 42 Assess the political importance of de Gaulle to post-war France.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events De Gaulle was a national hero by 1944 and was the president of the provisional government which led to the Fourth Republic. He was chosen as head of the new government in November 1945, which favoured a strong Presidency, and resigned in 1946 when his views were rejected. He could not work with the Communists, the largest party. His sudden resignation in January 1946 may have had the hope behind it that France would rally to a strong man. However, there was a greater desire to return to normalcy than to increase military spending, the issue of contention with the left. He attempted to form a new movement – the RPF but despite initial support, this failed to emerge as a political force. He went into retirement in 1953 but re-emerged in 1958 in the midst of the crisis over Algeria as president of the Fifth Republic. He denied any ambition to rule as a dictator, but wished to strengthen the presidency and to restore the prestige of France after disasters in Vietnam, Suez and the danger of a civil war over Algeria. He granted independence to Algeria despite the opposition of the right and the European settlers. He took a strong nationalist line over the entry of Britain to the Common Market and developed France's nuclear weapons. He asserted France's independence by withdrawing from Nato. By recognizing Communist China, by opposing Israel in the Six Day war and by being critical of US policy in Vietnam. He had a vision of a united Europe and secured better relations with Germany offering a French-German alignment as the basis of European policy. The economic growth rates since 1945 had been high, but more social and economic strains were emerging since 1968 and de Gaulle's style had created animosity on the left and particularly among students and trade unions. He overcame the crisis of 1968, and the elections of 1968 saw strong national support, but he resigned in April 1969.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Judgements will focus on the initial establishment of a post-war democratic state, but his insistence on stronger government. This may seem to be vindicated by the situation of 1958 or de Gaulle may seem to be a dangerous throw back to the elected dictatorship of Louis Napoleon. His prestige and army support may have saved France from civil war over Algeria and resolved the greatest post-war crisis. His espousal of nationalism at the expense of the Anglo-Saxon domination which he perceived may have given France a sense of identify and worth in the post-war era to compensate for the humiliations of the Fourth republic, or may be seen as a sort of adventurism which gained little. It could be seen that de Gaulle's outdated political style and vision had once again endangered France politically by 1968. He was and is a controversial figure, so no set view is expected but better answers will offer a balanced judgement and maintain a focus on the question.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 49</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

**43 How successful were Italy's governments in dealing with domestic problems in this period?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. After the war the main political party was the Christian Democratic Party under de Gasperi who was prime minister from 1945 to 1953. A referendum led to a Republic in 1946. Italy had to rebuild its economy, eradicate fascism, re-enter the international community and establish a stable parliamentary system under a republic. The social and political divisions caused by the fascist era had to be healed and long-term problems of regional difference had to be addressed. Pre-1922 political fragmentation returned and coalitions were common. There was some attempt at land reform, but by the 1960s there were social and economic inequalities sufficient to lead to strikes and student unrest. Attempts to devolve power to the regions in 1970 were made, but the 1970s saw inflation, unemployment and strikes. Government had to cope with political extremism in the late 1970s and 1980s and the murder of Aldo Moro in 1978 was a low point. The domination of the Christian Democrats was challenged in the 1980s but not finally ended until 1994. The political system did prove flexible enough to overcome corruption scandals, to prevent regional break away, to bring in the Democrats of the Left (a former Communist, d'Alema became premier in 1998).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Better answers will attempt a judgement. Many problems remained and intensified, but Italy did not return to authoritarian rule. There were periods where instability was more pronounced and better answers will see some distinction between , say, the establishment of a parliamentary democracy and recovery from the ravages of war and the instabilities of the 1970s. There may be, too, a distinction between political developments and social and economic progress. No set answer or judgement is excepted.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 50	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

### Section 9: Themes c. 1914–2000

#### 44 How far did industrial growth in Europe depend on the intervention of the state in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Obviously the contrast is between the heavy state intervention in totalitarian countries and those countries which depended on traditional liberal capitalism and free trade, or international trade agreements. The role of the state did increase in most countries, but not to the same extent. The state intervened in different ways. In the USSR there was a state-led industrialisation programme, but in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany the intervention was less direct. The wars were obviously periods where there was greater state intervention. After 1945 this was maintained more in some countries than others. Factors apart from state intervention include the development of international trade organisations, the growth of technology – especially the development of lighter industry and electronics – the development of internal demand; the sophistication of capital development and globalization towards the end of the period.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The range of exemplification is likely to vary. For higher mark bands ‘how far’ will be tackled with state intervention being compared to other factors and a distinction being drawn between free market and command economies.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 51	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

**45 What best accounts for the speed of the decolonisation of the European empires after 1945?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. It could be argued that before the war the European empires were under pressure. There were nationalist movements and the economic crisis of the 1930s had reduced the capacity of European countries to hold down colonies by force. However, the Second World War was highly important. The rise of Japan undermined any assumptions about inherent European superiority in Asia. The humiliation of France and the German occupation of the Netherlands and Belgium cut off colonies from their homeland and showed the vulnerability of the home countries. The war was fought on the Allies side for democracy and freedom, which sat unhappily with a return to pre-war colonialism. The rise of Communism, especially in China, saw an egalitarian model and gave nationalist movements an ideology. Post-war weaknesses in Europe prevented resources being applied to defeat colonial revolts and neither of the post-1945 superpowers condoned European colonialism. In purely military terms guerrilla warfare, sometimes inspired by the Chinese Communist model, proved hard to deal with and led to violent repression which was less acceptable at home after the war than before. The nationalist leadership was often highly effective and there was a ‘domino’ effect as the success of nationalism in, say, India, and the victory of Mao were key indicators that Western influence overseas could be successfully challenged.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There should, in better answers, be some range of exemplification, and some distinction between different explanation, possibly balancing purely local factors, such as a strong leader with factors which affected the home country’s ability or willingness to maintain empires. Even when countries were determined – such as France – the difficulties of sustaining colonial wars proved too great. In other cases, there was much less commitment to holding on to colonial areas which had proved more trouble than they were worth.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 52	Mark Scheme Pre-U – May/June 2013	Syllabus 9769	Paper 23
---------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------

**46 ‘There has been much more significant political than social change in the role of women in Europe since 1945.’ Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. In Western Europe there was the post-war emergence of high-profile women leaders like Cresson and Bruntland. However where women did take on political leadership it was often in ‘social’ ministries like education and social welfare. Parliamentary representation only increased significantly in Scandinavia by 1970. In France and Italy it fell. After 1970 there was greater political influence as the scope of what constituted ‘political’ issues widened and the influence of feminist ideas increased. The increase in female political influence continued to rise in Scandinavia and spread to Southern Europe as issues such as abortion and equal pay became political issues. Women played a larger role as environmental issues entered the political domain. There were important contributions made by women to debates about disarmament. Against this purely political change the social changes might include more educational and employment opportunities, changes in life style brought about by improvements in home technology, greater sexual freedom with changes in contraception, and the influence of greater urbanisation. In Eastern Europe the ideology supported political and social equality but there was some variation between countries under Communism.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The better answers will consider ‘significant’ change and discuss the extent of both political life and social change, perhaps challenging the main idea in the question. The emergence of strong women leaders perhaps disguised the much slower acceptance of women in political life generally. Social change might seem in fact more significant, though the depth and extent of change can be challenged.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 53</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

**47 ‘Popular culture was more important than traditional elite culture in Europe in the 1960s and 1970s.’ Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. ‘High culture’ might be seen in terms of ‘classical music’, gallery art, self-consciously purposeful literature, documentary TV or ‘serious’ Drama. Popular culture might be seen as ‘pop’ or ‘rock’ music, novels with no higher purpose than to entertain or distract, TV or radio with little ‘profound’, ‘improving’ or ‘serious’ content like quiz shows or soap operas or ‘reality’ TV like talent shows. Candidates should indicate some definition. Importance, too, needs to be clarified – did high culture become increasingly formalised and unapproachable, or else too rooted in the past, leaving the way open for popular culture to reflect the real life of a mass audience; to reflect more democratic aspirations; to offer a nurturing shared experience?

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Better candidates will be able to establish their understanding of the nature of culture and to offer an informed judgement, but the exemplification will obviously vary.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 54</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

#### 48 Assess the impact of immigration on Europe after 1945.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates could consider immigration from outside Europe and also immigration from different parts of the continent to others. There might be consideration of the impact of ‘guest workers’ often bringing different cultures and attitudes and creating tensions – for example Turks in Germany or North Africans in France. The expansion of the Western European economies needed more labour. So the effects were not only negative. The decolonization process involved immigration, including former colonists. The huge migrations in the immediate post-war period could be discussed. The political impacts could be considered as could the impact on Europe’s economic, social and cultural life.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is no set expectation on the exemplification of analysis of impact, but better answers will focus on the extent of the impact, possibly considering different parts of Europe and different periods, rather than generalising.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 55</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>23</b>

#### **49 Did radio or television make the more significant impact on European life in this period?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates could consider the way that radio broke down social and regional boundaries, shaped taste in music, brought more information, encouraged a desire for electricity, affected the relationship between town and countryside, and brought Europe into closer touch with international culture. The political use of radio might be discussed in totalitarian regimes. The wartime use of radio to break censorship might be talked about. The rise of TV came on the back of a taste for mass entertainment and either could be said to have made more impact – with greater impact on social life, leisure habits, internationalization of culture or less as radio had set up change beforehand.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Some supported judgement is required but the exemplification is likely to vary considerably. Better answers will make discrimination between countries and periods.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.