



General Certificate of Education

History 5041/6041

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

Mark Scheme

2005 examination – June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1:

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

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

Level 2:

Either

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

Or

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 3:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 4:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 5:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

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

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

Level 1:

Either

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

Or

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

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

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

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

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

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

Level 2:*Either*

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

Or

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

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

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

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

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

Level 3:

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

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

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

Level 4:

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

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

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

Level 5:

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

Exemplification/guidance

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

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

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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

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

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

So, is the response:

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

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

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

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

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the importance of “the tax burden” in the context of the French Revolution in 1789. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. limited reference to how the Third Estate paid the majority of the taxes in France. **1**

- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the First Estate (represented by the priest in the source) and the Second Estate (represented by the military officer) were exempt from the *taille* and imposed feudal dues such as the *corvée* (forced labour on the roads) on the Third Estate (the peasant crushed by the huge weight). In 1789 the *cahiers* of the Third Estate reflected a demand for financial equality and the abolition of feudal dues and rights. **2-3**

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

Explain how **Source C** challenges the views expressed in **Source B** in relation to the impact of the French Revolution on the nobility. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

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

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. very brief reference to the limited impact the Revolution had on the nobility on Source C compared to the significant impact in Source B. **1-2**

- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. to develop the contrasting views of the impact of the Revolution on the nobility. Source B argues that the nobility “were among the greatest losers from the Revolution” and the “main victims”. In contrast Source C states that the “nobility were far from being destroyed” and “remained more or less unchanged”. Candidates may also examine the different stances the sources take on the financial impact of the Revolution on the nobility. Source C argues that the

nobility were largely untouched financially by the Revolution whereas Source B argues that the loss of feudal dues could amount to “60% of their income”. It also states that the nobility had to pay more in taxation and “lost their financial privileges”. Own knowledge may include brief reference to the August Decrees. **3-5**

- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. in addition to the differences of the sources the similarities may also be examined, e.g. loss of status in society (Source C) and loss of financial privileges and domination of high offices (Source B) and linked to the impact of the August Decrees on the position of the nobility. Some of the French nobility escaped persecution by emigrating and returning after the upheaval of Revolution. **6-7**

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

Explain the ways in which the Revolution successfully changed social and economic inequality in France between 1789 and 1794. *(15 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

- L2: ***Either***

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

Or

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

Or

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

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

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

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

Indicative content

The Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen, 1789, declared that “men are born free and equal in their rights”. The extent to which the Revolution changed the social and economic inequality in France is to be considered by candidates in response to this question. Candidates should be able to compare the social and economic condition of France in 1789 with that of 1794 and assess what had changed and why by looking at the “winners and losers” of the Revolution. Level 3 answers and above will focus on the key word “successfully” and attempt to balance their responses. Level 1 and Level 2 responses will probably fail to make a distinction between social and economic changes, responses at Level 3 and above will attempt to make the distinction, however this may not be fully clear even at Level 4 and Level 5. It is assumed that candidates will have more secure knowledge on the changes in society. Weaker candidates will probably fail to distinguish between the different social groups or just focus on the nobility (as given in the sources). At Level 3 candidates will demonstrate an understanding of how the positions of various groups in society changed and begin to evaluate the extent to which inequality had been overcome, this will be clearer at Level 4 and Level 5. Examples could include the impact of the August Decrees on the nobility, the growth in power and influence of the bourgeoisie who benefited from the reforms of the Constituent Assembly (careers open to talent, voting limited to property owners, sale of *biens nationaux*). The impact of the revolution on the peasantry was mixed. Peasants gained from the abolition of indirect taxation and the feudal dues, however the negative impact of the Revolution on the economy of France, the forced requisitioning of grain and the Maximum meant that many were worse off. The poor suffered terribly as the abolition of the tithe meant that the Church could no longer pay for aid for the poor. The sans-culottes had mixed fortunes; they gained politically and in social status under the rule of the Jacobins and benefited from the General Maximum, but lost out when the Maximum was applied to wages. Material on the economy is expected to be thin; even at Levels 4 and 5 candidates may only assess economic inequality through an examination of the burden of taxation.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “the Civil Code” in the context of Napoleon’s rule of his French Empire. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. brief reference to laws which were a benefit of Napoleon’s rule taken to the Empire to improve “oppressed people’s” lives. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. references to the creation of a legal system which simplified the existing complicated and contradictory customary laws. Understanding that the Civil Code, later known as Code Napoleon abolished feudalism but was also one method used by Napoleon to control the subjects of his Empire by increasing police supervision. **2-3**
-

- (b) Explain why Napoleon created an Empire in Europe. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. to protect France. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. explaining why Napoleon created an Empire. Examples range from Napoleon’s “official reasons” – the desire to create national states under French rule, to spread the ideas of the Revolution such as liberty and equality and to bring about the end of feudalism and the ancien regime. More practical reasons include: protecting France’s borders from hostile enemies, increasing French resources and income through plunder and the provision of men for his armies through conscription. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. may question the extent to which the Empire was planned and possibly argue that the Empire happened by chance as a result of Napoleon’s various military campaigns (detail of military campaigns is not a requirement). Candidates may recognise that the creation of an Empire helped to secure Napoleon’s position within France by diverting attention from possible trouble at home and by providing material for a glorious and heroic propaganda image. **6-7**

- (c) “Napoleon’s rule of the Empire in Europe brought many positive benefits to his subjects outside France.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

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

Indicative content

Responses should demonstrate an understanding about the impact of Napoleon's rule on the various sections of his Empire, the *pays reunis* (annexed territories), *pays conquis* (satellite states) and *pays allies* (allied states), and assess the extent to which the experience was positive or negative. Answers at Level 4 and Level 5 may also consider the "heir of the Revolution" debate with material linked to the rule of Napoleon in territories outside France. Answers which rely on material and examples from within France are at best implicit and should not be awarded marks higher than low Level 2. For those territories annexed before 1806 the impact of Napoleon's rule was generally a positive experience. Ruled from Paris, territories such as Nice, Savoy, Belgium, German lands west of the Rhine and Piedmont were regarded as extensions of "old France". Napoleon's reforms such as the Concordat, Civil Codes, Imperial University, judicial process of civil and criminal courts flourished, whilst there was some resentment of the taxation system and liability for conscription. Territories annexed after 1806 (e.g. Parma, Papal States, Hansa towns) had less time to adjust to Napoleonic conquest and the ideals of legal equality and rationalisation of resources were often subordinated to Napoleons military and financial needs and his personal dynastic ambitions. The experience of Napoleonic rule for the satellite states was largely negative. Far from experiencing liberty, equality and the abolishment of feudalism, the satellite states were strictly supervised by France and often ruled by a member of Napoleon's family (Eugene in Italy, Joseph in Naples to 1808 then Spain). Satellite states were there to serve the interests of France, to form a strategically important buffer zone and to provide the vast majority of troops for the *Grand Armee*. The military and financial demands made upon the satellite state of the Kingdom of Italy destroyed its economy. Throughout the Empire Napoleon denied the right to democracy and popular sovereignty as all freedom of political expression was crushed. As in France only the rich had much to thank Napoleon for.

Level 1 answers will make vague assertions about how Napoleon's rule affected the Empire. At Level 2 answers will be more descriptive about a limited range of Napoleon's reforms and their impact on the Empire with little or no distinction between the satellite states and annexed territories. At Level 3 there will be a brief attempt to qualify the impact of Napoleon's rule throughout the different parts of the Empire with some attempt to address positive and negative aspects. Level 4 answers will be balanced and at Level 5 judgement about the impact of Napoleon's rule of the Empire will be demonstrated.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by the “Eastern Powers” in the context of European states’ co-operation in the years 1815 to 1820. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the Eastern Powers were against revolution. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the Eastern Powers were Austria, Russia and Prussia, members of the Holy Alliance since 1815. The Eastern Powers represented one side of the ideological divide in the Congress System, autocratic and reactionary, whilst Britain and France were more liberal. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the Troppau Protocol was signed by the three Eastern Powers in November 1820. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. may use the source to illustrate how the Eastern Powers wanted to “resist revolution”. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. to explain why the Eastern Powers signed the Troppau Protocol. Develops references to more than one of the following: threats to the balance of power through political unrest in Germany and France and/or the outbreak of Revolutions in Naples and Spain, a fear of liberalism and nationalism from the autocratic monarchies. the abandonment of liberal sympathies by Alexander I and Metternich’s desire to prevent Russia’s expansion Westwards. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. responses which clearly understand Austria’s and Metternich’s position in 1820 following the outbreak of revolution in Naples are clearly Level 3. Metternich was faced with a possible Franco-Russian front which would weaken Austria’s position. As France and Britain only sent observers to the Troppau Congress Metternich was able to work upon Alexander I’s fear of revolution and persuade him to fully abandon his liberal sympathies and fully support Austria in a policy of suppressing any revolution. Prussia readily followed Austria’s lead as any independent foreign policy decision had been virtually given up since the outbreak of unrest in the German states in 1818. **6-7**

- (c) “The successes of the Congress System in the years 1815 to 1825 outweighed its failures.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Agreement with the statement

Between 1815 and 1823 the Congress System did create the basis for a stable international order and although there were uprisings and revolutions within states these were confined and did not erupt into a general European war. France was successfully reintegrated into the international community at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle without destroying the Quadruple Alliance which was maintained as a safeguard against further French aggression. Between 1815 and 1820 Britain and Austria co-operated in order to contain Russian and French ambitions which helped to maintain stability throughout Europe. By 1820 Russia was no longer considered to be an expansionist power and had signed the Troppau Protocol which committed her to the defence of the status quo against the spread of liberal and revolutionary ideas. Austrian military action in Italy was legitimated by the international community – if with British reservations.

Disagreement with the statement

The Congress System was hindered by its attempt to maintain peace by international co-operation in a number of ways. There were no pre-set agendas or secretariat and meetings

were convened on an ad-hoc basis. The Great Powers were generally divided on issues and increasingly pursued matters of self-interest, e.g. at Aix and Troppau Metternich was concerned about Russian intervention and feared a Franco-Russian alignment, whilst France wanted to secure the revision of the Vienna Treaty. There was a failure to establish the principles on which the Great powers were to co-operate: Article VI of the treaty of November 1815, The Holy Alliance or the Troppau Protocol? The fatal flaw of the Congress System was that it was inflexible and was unable to accommodate the differing views on what constituted a serious threat to the peace in Europe, thus the revolts in Spain, Naples and Greece split the five power alliance. From 1820 and the signing of the Troppau Protocol the Congress System was doomed to failure.

At Level 1 answers are likely to make undeveloped statements about the Congress System and/or the Congress of Vienna. At Level 2 agreement or disagreement with the statement will be inferred through a description of the four Congresses OR have a limited overview of the Congress System with little secure supporting evidence. Level 3 answers will demonstrate some understanding of one side of the debate. At Level 4 answers will be balanced and have secure examples of successful and unsuccessful attempts to keep the peace through co-operation. At Level 5 judgement will be demonstrated about why ultimately the Congress System eventually collapsed by 1823.

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

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

Question 1

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

How fully do **Source C** and **Source D** explain the impact of economic change in France during the years 1871 to 1914? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Indicative content

At Level 1 there will be uncontrolled use of the sources and limited recognition of the contrasting views, e.g. Source C sees a period of “considerable boom”, Source D a period of “slow and steady expansion”. At Level 2 candidates will recognise that the extent of economic change is different in the sources, e.g. Source C refers to a “*belle époque*”, “thriving banks” and “considerable boom” whilst Source D is more cautious as it refers to “slow steady expansion” and comments about France falling to “fourth greatest industrial power”. The greatest contrast in the sources is about the social impact of change. Source C is negative, referring to a “social problem”, the growth of socialism and trade unionism, whilst Source D is positive referring to wealth “filtering down” and a growth in real wages of 50%. Level 3 answers will make explicit comments about the extent of contrast in the sources and use own knowledge about the growth of socialism and trade unionism to support the claims made in the sources, e.g. references to the CGT, syndicalism and strikes (reference to the 1910 rail strike could be made) or references to a steady 9% expansion in the economy since 1895 ensured that most workers were not militant and in any case only a small proportion worked in industry. Level 4 answers will demonstrate a very clear understanding of the contrasts within the sources. Both sources agree that France did experience considerable economic growth, however Source D qualifies the growth with comparisons to Europe, for example Germany’s economic growth rate was over 30%, which emphasises that French expansion was more moderate in comparison to her competitors.

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

To what extent did economic growth and prosperity promote political stability in France in the years 1814 to 1914? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

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

It is not necessary to have detailed knowledge of the whole period in the same depth but answers must cover the two themes (economic growth and political stability) and show understanding of continuity and change through the 100 years. Many will argue that economic depression led to political instability and Revolution as in 1830 and 1848. However the evidence in the sources should lead candidates to argue that economic growth and prosperity also brought about new political challenges for the various regimes throughout the period 1814–1914. Source A argues that “economic development boosted the strength of the bourgeoisie” which strengthened opposition to the Bourbon monarchy. Source B argues that Louis Napoleon’s Second Republic experienced successful economic policies which also increased political opposition to his rule from three groups, the traditional elite, the middle

classes and the masses. Source C refers to the economic “*belle époque*” which resulted in the growth of socialism and the trade unions. Therefore whilst economic growth and prosperity was desirable to create a politically stable regime it created social changes and the development of a more politically aware population who could through greater education express their discontent with a regime. In contrast Source D gives evidence that slow and steady industrial expansion created the foundations for a stable society under the Third Republic as wealth was more evenly distributed. After examining the impact of the economy on political stability candidates can legitimately examine other factors causing political stability/instability e.g. mistakes by individual leaders, conflict between Republican/left wing and Monarchist/right wing forces, political scandal etc.

Level 1 responses will make assertions about economic growth and political instability and will probably fail to cover the 100 year period. Level 2 responses will demonstrate a limited and often implicit understanding through descriptive narrative about the impact of the economy on political stability and will have little secure evidence across the period. At Level 3 both the sources and own knowledge must be used to demonstrate a more explicit understanding of the connections between economic growth and political stability – evidence may not be secure across the period. At Level 3 there may be more focus on other factors which promoted political stability/instability. Level 4 responses will be balanced and have a secure range of evidence (but not all encompassing) over the 100 years. At Level 5 judgement will be demonstrated about the positive and negative benefits of a growing and stable economy on the political stability of France during 1814–1914.

Section B

Question 2 onward

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

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

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: ***Either***

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

Or

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

1-6

- L2: ***Either***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***
 Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**
- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

OPTION A: Italian Unification, 1848–1871

Question 2

“The ideas and actions of Mazzini were central to the failure of the 1848 revolutions in the Italian States.” (20 marks)

To what extent do you agree with this view?

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Agreement with the view

Mazzini believed in the creation of a nation state – a union of all Italian speaking provinces - built by “the people”, democracy and republicanism. His view was shared by a very small minority, most of whom belonged to the middle and upper classes. Thus the appeal of Mazzinian democracy was limited and failed to inspire the mass of peasantry. Mazzinian nationalism was considered radical and revolutionary by conservative politicians such as Cavour and D’Azeglio and had to be eradicated as it posed a real threat to the dominance of High Politics. The creation of the Rome Republic in February 1849 threatened to overturn the social and political order. As part of the triumvirate Mazzini ordered the redistribution of

some of the Church land, abolished censorship of the press and Church control of education. This displeased Catholic opinion throughout the Italian States and Europe resulting in the Rome Republic being crushed by forces of the French Second Republic. 1848–1849 revealed the weakness of Mazzinian tactics, the limited support for revolution, the unlikelihood of “Italians” to liberate themselves and the need to suppress Mazzinianism in order to gain vital outside support if Italy was ever to be united.

Disagreement with the view

There were many factors which contributed to the failure of the 1848–1849 revolutions in Italy. Prior to the declaration of the Rome Republic in February 1849 Austrian forces had re-gathered and reasserted their military dominance over the Italian States. Charles Albert was an incompetent general and poor leader more concerned about extending Piedmont and preserving his own autocratic power – it could be argued that his role created as much division within the ranks of the revolutionaries. Mazzinian democracy was only one of the many conflicting aims and divisions within the Italian nationalists and revolutionaries. The leaders of the revolts in Milan and Venice mistrusted Piedmont and the Rome Republic.

Level 1 responses will possibly narrate the course of the revolutions or give a partial biographical account of Mazzini. At Level 2 responses will examine the failure of the revolutions with little focus on the role of Mazzini. Level 3 answers will begin to make explicit links between Mazzini and the failure of the revolutions. At Level 4 responses will be balanced and at Level 5 judgement about the role of Mazzini will be made.

Question 3

“Foreign intervention hindered rather than helped the cause of Italian unification in the years 1848 to 1870.”

To what extent do you agree with this view?

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Agreement with the view

Austrian and French troops defeated the 1848-49 revolutions in Italy. Austrian dominance of the Italian states was the greatest obstacle to political change until the late 1850s. Napoleon III, although a champion of Italian unity, prevented the full unification of Italy until 1871 because of his commitment to protect the Pope. His actions at Villafranca can be seen as a betrayal of the cause of Italian unification as Venetia was to remain under Habsburg rule and control of Modena and Parma was not given to Piedmont. British neutrality and the promise of Prussian support for Austria all contributed to Napoleon making peace with the Austrians. Ultimately foreign powers intervened in Italian affairs for their own benefit, to promote their

own interests. Napoleon III interest in Italy was in part promotion of the dynastic future of the Bonaparte family.

Disagreement with the view

The main lesson learnt from the failure of the 1848–1849 revolutions in Italy was that she could not unite without foreign support to expel the Austrians. Napoleon’s meeting with Cavour at Plombieres, although tempered by Villafranca, did bring gains for the cause of Italian unity. British moral approval for Italian unification had an important impact on the process of unification. In 1860 the British bitterly opposed the French annexation of Nice and Savoy. The Royal Navy allowed Garibaldi and his “thousand” to cross the Straits of Messina, which resulted in the unification of the South which was then handed to Victor Emmanuel at Teano. On the 27 October 1860 the British made a public announcement welcoming Italian unity and offering British troops if any power intervened. The actions of Prussia in 1866 (Venetia) and 1871 (Rome) completed the unification process.

Level 1 responses will narrate the course of unification. At Level 2 responses maybe more descriptive with mainly implicit links to the impact of foreign intervention. Level 3 answers will have more secure evidence about a range of countries who intervened in Italian affairs with some focus on hindered and helped. Answers which fail to cover the entire period, e.g. end in 1861, should not be awarded above Level 3. Level 4 responses will be balanced with explicit links and secure evidence about a range of countries that intervened in Italian affairs. Level 5 responses will have clear judgement and a well developed line of argument about the impact of foreign intervention on the course of Italian unification across the period.

Question 4

“Italy became unified but Italians remained as divided as ever.”

To what extent do you agree with this assessment of Italy in the years 1861 to 1871?

(20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

There should be broad agreement with this view. For a balanced response candidates should examine the process of Piedmontisation between 1861 and 1871 and then assess the impact of the new centralised political and economic structure on the regions of Italy and the people who lived there.

Examples of unification/Piedmontisation

The Statuto ensured that the model of strong central government and weak local government prevailed. The legal system was unified and imposed on all (except Tuscany). The Civil Code was adopted in 1865. Piedmont religious laws formally separated Church and State, a

unified Italian Army was created and education was the central states responsibility. A common system of weights, measures and currency was applied and internal trade barriers removed. Venetia (1866) and Rome (1870) were added to Italy.

Examples of division

The North-South divide. The Brigands' War (1860–1866) expressed the bitter resentment of those Neapolitans who wanted the restoration of the Bourbons, the powers of the Catholic Church and local autonomy. Sicily revolted in 1866 against the oppressive rule from the North and conscription. Only 2% of the population had the vote and only 1% of the population spoke Italian. Piedmont's attack on the Catholic Church intensified opposition to the State from those in the South and the publication of the Syllabus of Errors in 1864, which was an attack by the Church on liberalism, widened the gap between Church and State. Resentment increased further with the increase in taxation to pay off Piedmont's debt and the damaging effects of free trade to the southern economy. Many Italians lived in the Italia Irredenta, e.g. Tyrol, Trentino and Istria.

Level 1 answers will assert points about unity and division. Level 2 responses may describe the condition of Italy between 1861 and 1871 with implicit links to unity and division. At Level 3 candidates should have an explicit understanding and a range of evidence about unity and division, but answers may not be secure on one section. Level 4 responses will be balanced and have a secure range of evidence which is well selected. At Level 5 clear judgement will be demonstrated about the impact of Piedmontisation on the states in the South of the Peninsula of Italy.

OPTION B: Russia, 1848–1881

Question 5

“It was above all the preservation of autocracy, rather than the desire to expand Russian territory, that motivated Nicholas I to send troops to crush the Hungarian uprising of 1848–1849.”

How valid is this view?

(20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

This key to a successful answer is to determine the primary motivation for Russian foreign policy. Nicholas I decision to send troops into Hungary can be interpreted as pro-active and an extension of an aggressive foreign policy which wanted to extend Russian influence in Europe and the near East. He wanted to be seen as the “gendarme of Europe” as he firmly believed in his God-given duty to defend Europe against revolution and uphold the Holy Alliance. By supporting Austria and sending troops into Hungary Nicholas I would gain Austrian favour which would allow Russia to increase her power in the Balkans.

Alternatively Nicholas I can be interpreted as acting defensively in 1848. Although Russia did not experience Revolution in 1848–1849 it can be argued that the Tsar feared that the Hungarian uprising would create an independent republic on the border with Poland. The Polish Revolt of 1831 had been crushed by Russian troops and Nicholas I’s rule was ruthless, however Polish resentment remained. The growth of liberal and nationalistic opposition to autocracy within the Empire increased and the fear of revolution ensured that Nicholas I reacted harshly e.g. the attack on Petrashevsky circle in 1849 and the reduction in student numbers from 4600 in 1848 to 3600 in 1854.

Level 1 responses will either assert threats to the autocracy or narrate the events of 1848–1849. At Level 2 Answers will be more descriptive about Nicholas I’s rule with little explicit focus on the motives of foreign policy. At Level 3 there will be some explicit connections made between the domestic condition of Russia and the decision to send troops into Hungary. Level 4 answers will have a balanced line of argument about the motivations of Russian foreign policy in 1848. Level 5 responses will display clear judgement and secure knowledge.

Question 6

“By 1881 Tsarist rule was challenged more by economic than by political problems.”
How valid is this assessment of the rule of Alexander II? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

The focus of answers should be an assessment of the last years of Alexander II rule. Responses should consider the impact of Tsarist reforms on the political and economic condition of the Empire to 1881. A description of Alexander II’s reforms is not required and answers that do so should be limited to Level 2.

Political problems by 1881

1878 witnessed the end of the Turkish War and the increase in revolutionary activity which used terror as a weapon within the Russian Empire. The failure to gain Constantinople at the Congress of Berlin further alienated the educated Russian classes. Vera Zasulich attempted to assassinate St Petersburg Chief of Police and despite overwhelming evidence against her the jury found her not guilty. “The People’s Will” dedicated itself to the assassination of the Tsar. Alexander II survived a number of attempts to assassinate him before he was murdered in March 1881.

It can be argued that Alexander II as “Tsar Liberator” increased radical and revolutionary opposition to the Tsarist regime because the reforms introduced did not go far enough, they raised the expectations of change without satisfying the aspirations of many Russians. Superficially reforms in education, the legal system, the establishment of zemstvas, the

emancipation of the serfs etc. appeared to bring Russia into line with the more liberal Western European states, but in reality the regime remained autocratic and subject to few restraints. Due to the police system, harsh punishment and censorship, opposition to the regime who wanted increased reform turned to radical and revolutionary methods, hence the creation of groups like the “People’s Will” who significantly contributed to the political crisis faced by Alexander II at the end of his regime.

Economic Problems by 1881

The Emancipation the Serfs (1861) failed to rejuvenate a stagnating economy. Agriculture still failed to supply the rapidly increasing population with sufficient food. The creation of the Mir limited the migration of serfs to industrial towns whilst redemption payments cripple future generations of Russian peasantry. However, significant economic reforms had been made. Railway construction had increased, state finances had been restructured and banking systems had been established.

Level 1 answers will superficially narrate the course of Alexander II’s reforms. Level 2 answers will have more descriptive detail with assertive comments about the political and economic situation by 1881. At Level 3 understanding will be demonstrated (not always explicitly) about how reforms increased political opposition to the regime and failed to improve the economic condition of the Empire. Level 4 responses will have a clear and explicit understanding of the political and economic problems facing Russia in 1881 and begin to draw conclusions about the degree to which they challenged Tsardom. At Level 5 judgement will be made about the state of autocracy in the last years of Alexander II’s reign and conclusions draw about the strengths and weaknesses of his leadership in dealing with political an economic issues.

Question 7

“Tsardom was weak but the various elements of political opposition were weaker.”
How valid is this view of Russia in the years 1855 to 1881? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Agreement with the view

Political opposition to Tsarism varied from the moderate to the radical and was therefore ideologically divided. The works of intellectuals like Herzen and Lavrov promoted the formation of the Populists (*Narodniks*) which idealised the peasant as the heart of a new society and encouraged self-education. They began a ‘To the People’ crusade in 1873 where some 3,000 students journeyed to the countryside to encourage a socialist revolution. Populism failed to win mass support and groups like ‘Land and Liberty’ and ‘People’s Will’ developed as terrorist organisations promoting social revolution through acts of political

assassination. Therefore political opposition also disagreed on the practical methods to oppose the regime. Between 1879 and 1880 Alexander II survived three attempts on his life, but was eventually assassinated in March 1881 by the ‘People’s Will’. However, their act of violence did not trigger a general revolution.

Disagreement with the view

Political and nationalist opposition may have been divided but it was increasingly rendered ineffective by the harsh repressive measures that the Tsarist regime enforced. In 1862 prominent radicals were arrested for sedition, political opponents were imprisoned and exiled to Siberia. Censorship was increased and leading radical journals were closed down, zemstovs were forbidden to communicate with each other and police supervision of the universities was increased. Following the nationalist revolt in Poland rigid Russification was imposed in an attempt to quash nationalism, the property of the Polish Catholic Church was confiscated (1864), the university was closed (1869) and Russian was imposed as the administrative language.

Level 1 responses will either give an incomplete narrative or assert reasons why opposition was ineffective. Level 2 responses will probably describe a limited range of opposition groups and make implicit links to the question of division and ineffectiveness. At Level 3 the range of evidence will be more secure and a limited understanding of both sides of the argument will be demonstrated. At Level 4 answers will be balanced and there will be a consideration of internal and external reasons for the weaknesses in the opposition to Tsarism. Level 5 responses will have a clear and strong line of argument, supported by well selected evidence demonstrating judgement about the reasons for weaknesses in opposition to the Tsarist regime.

OPTION C: The unification of Germany, 1848–1871

Question 8

“The 1848–1849 revolutions were a complete failure for the German liberal movement and an overwhelming victory for the forces of conservatism.”

To what extent do you agree with this view?

(20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

The focus of responses should be the results, not causes, of the 1848–1849 revolutions in Germany, with specific focus on the positive and negative results for German liberalism.

Agreement with the view

It can be argued that 1848–1849 marked the defeat of liberalism in Germany, that they lost their political initiative and from then on looked to the established governing circles to maintain social stability and order. Thus the future unified Germany was to be a conservative/nationalist/militaristic state rather than a liberal one. The failure of the Frankfurt Parliament can be used as an example of how German liberalism completely failed in 1848–1849. Frankfurt failed to gain mass support as it was a product of a narrow “liberal” middle class franchise. The majority of moderate members alienated the more radical and conservative groups which fatally divided the Parliament. Von Gagern was an ineffective leader and there was no administration or army to carry out decisions. The Frankfurt Parliament was unable to win the loyalty of individual German states. In Prussia the revolution was crushed by troops and the constitution granted was much more conservative than the Waldeck Charter as the crown was to have the absolute veto over legislation. By 1849 the conservative status quo had been fully restored.

Disagreement with the view

The Revolution was not a complete failure and liberalism survived (it can be argued that liberalism was only fully defeated by Bismarck in 1878). Most of the peasantry’s feudal dues had been abolished and most importantly Prussia emerged with a constitution and emerged as a potential ally for the liberal and nationalist cause. The Zollverien continued to economically unify Germany along the liberal principles of free trade.

Level 1 response will probably give an incomplete narrative of the course of the 1848–1849 Revolutions in the German states. At Level 2 there will be a little focus on the outcomes for German liberalism through description of the Revolutions. Level 3 answers will have more explicit focus on results for German liberalism through a narrow focus, e.g. Frankfurt. At Level 4 responses will be balanced with a brief consideration of success, the range of evidence will be wider and more secure (perhaps reference to Prussia). Level 5 answers will have judgement, clearly identifying liberal aims in 1848 and relating them to the negative and positive outcomes of the Revolutions.

Question 9

How far was growing Prussian military supremacy, rather than the expansion of the Prussian economy, responsible for the creation of a *Kleindeutsch* solution to the German problem in the years 1848 to 1866? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Candidates should consider the rise of Prussia against the decline of Austria and consider the extent to which Prussian military rather than economic strength contributed to the unification

of Germany without Austria. Candidates may also consider the diplomatic skill of Bismarck as long as it is related to Austria, but material about Bismarck should not create the bulk of the essay as the key dates are from 1848 to 1866.

Military Factors

Victory in the Seven Weeks' War revealed the superior strength and strategy of the Prussian military. Von Moltke was key to the success – he exploited Prussia's superior rail network and mobilised his forces in half the time of the Austrians. The breech-loading rifle gave Prussian troops a crucial military advantage over the Austrian muzzle-loading musket. The success of the Prussian military in 1866 was a far cry from the humiliating capitulation at Olmutz (1850) and was due to the army reforms of Von Roon, pushed through the Landtag by the appointment of Bismarck in 1862.

Economic Factors

The rise of the Prussian military machine followed the expansion of the economy through the Zollverein and industrialisation (railways, coal, iron, steel, textiles, Rhineland/Ruhr resources and heavy industry). Candidates may legitimately argue that "coal and iron" was more important in the defeat of Austria.

Diplomatic Factors

Bismarck's diplomacy isolated Austria following the Schleswig and Danish crises before the war with Prussia in 1866, which finally broke Austrian power in Germany and paved the way for a *Kleindeutsch* solution to the German problem.

Decline of Austria

Austria's restoration of power following the 1848/49 revolutions in the German States was short lived and in decline following the death of Schwarzenberg in 1852. Austria's economy was mainly agricultural and weakened by depression in the 1850s. Diplomatically involvement in Italian affairs (armed intervention in 1848-49, war with Piedmont and France in 1859), and tension with Russia (Crimean War) isolated Austria and drained her weakened economy and army.

Level 1 responses may give an incomplete narrative on the unification of Germany. At Level 2 will have some descriptive focus on military factors and the war in 1866, but have little explicit awareness of other factors. Level 3 answers will cover a range of factors with some secure supporting evidence. At Level 4 connections will be made and evidence secure over a range of factors. Level 5 responses will demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and judgement about the reasons why Austria was excluded from a united Germany.

Question 10

“An economic giant but politically immature.”

To what extent do you agree with this view of the German Empire in 1871? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Candidates are required to assess the political and economic condition of the united Germany in 1871.

Economic Condition

The Zollverein laid the foundations for German industrialisation and the 20 years prior to unification had witnessed uninterrupted economic and urban growth. In the Ruhr, the Saar and Silesia deposits of coal and iron were abundant. The growth of the railways (over 11,500 km of track by 1860) ensured quick transportation of goods. Unification and the French indemnity encouraged an economic boom, while the newly-gained iron ore of Lorraine stimulated the growth of the heavy industries.

Political Condition

In theory the German constitution of 1871 had some democratic elements. The Reichstag was elected by universal manhood suffrage by males over 25, it could accept and reject laws and approve or reject the budget. The introduction of universal suffrage promoted the development of well-organised mass political parties. In the Bundesrat Prussia's power was masked as with 17 out of 58 seats she was in the minority; however only 14 votes were required for a veto. In practice the constitution enabled the entrenchment of Prussia's military and bureaucratic classes, the Junkers, whose conservatism stifled political progress. Germany was far from democratic; the Emperor (always the King of Prussia) had far reaching powers, e.g. appointment and dismissal of the Chancellor, dissolution of the Reichstag, control of foreign policy, command of the army and the right to reinterpret the constitution. The Chancellor was not responsible to the Reichstag and could ignore its resolutions. The political parties were limited by the constitution to being either supporters of the Chancellor or part of his parliamentary Opposition.

Level 1 answers will assert references to economic and political condition of Germany in 1871. At Level 2 candidates may be more secure about the condition of the economy and have some descriptive detail about the impact of the Zollverein. Level 3 responses will be more explicit about the phrase “politically immature” and have some secure evidence about the limitations of the 1871 constitution as well as evidence about the condition of the economy. Level 4 responses will be balanced, with a secure range of evidence. At Level 5 candidates will demonstrate judgement about the political and economic condition of Germany in 1871.

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

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

Question 1

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

Assess the validity of the view in **Source A** about the importance of violence during the French Revolution. (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

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

Indicative content

At Level 1 candidates will identify Schama's view in the source that "violence was the Revolution's source of collective energy" and was therefore very important because it "was what made the Revolution revolutionary", without explaining why. At Level 2 and Level 3 the use of the extract will be more extensive and analytical rather than literal. Schama argues that violence began in 1789 and was not just restricted to the years of the Great Terror. Own knowledge to support this could include the violence that accompanied the great *journées* of 1789. At the storming of the Bastille, de Launay (the governor) was decapitated and his head was paraded on a pole around the streets. Peasant violence was at its height during the "Great Fear" and during the October Days several royal bodyguards were killed. The attack on the Tuileries on 10 August 1792 was reputed to be the bloodiest *journée* of the revolution. At Level 3 answers will show understanding of Schama's argument that violence was generated by the crowds and was not imposed by the Jacobins from above from 1792; this will be explicit in answers at Level 4. Level 3 and Level 4 answers will probably focus on and assess the extent to which violence was a driving force and an integral part of the Revolution's political culture from 1789. Rudé and Williams argue that violence was initially a reaction to the extreme economic circumstances that the crowds faced. Williams goes on to argue that the sans-culottes' "political temperament was naturally violent." For Marxists such as Soboul violence which resulted in the Terror was the natural and inevitable climax of the Revolution. Post-revisionists argue that the violence of 1789–1792 was not a precursor to the Terror and that the Terror emerged as an aberration, an exceptional reaction to an exceptional emergency, of defeat in war, threat of invasion, counter-revolutionary insurrections and a deteriorating economic situation.

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

How useful is this source as evidence about popular support for the policy of Terror?
(10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

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

Indicative content

Level 1 will make superficial statements about the content of the source and recognise that the source supports the Terror. Level 2 responses will use the extract more extensively and recognise that it is a primary source of evidence. For example, the language of the source is very emotive, dark and bloodthirsty. There is clear hostility shown towards the aristocracy, “immoral inhabitants of the palace of hell”, and no remorse shown for the execution of the Queen, “the slut Marie Antoinette”. There is a direct call for more violence and execution in order to save France and the Revolution from internal enemies: “the blade of vengeance should fall on all guilty heads”. At Level 3 and Level 4 candidates will focus on the provenance of the source more closely and relate this to their own knowledge about support for and opposition to the Jacobin policy of Terror. The source is an extract from the *William Tell* section of Paris and clearly illustrates the endorsement of the terror by militant sections of the sans-culottes. Pressure from the sans-culottes had led to a series of show trials which resulted in the guillotining of Marie Antoinette (16 October) and 31 Girondin deputies (31 October). Terror was taken to the provinces by the revolutionary armies and the representatives-on-mission. The source is clearly useful as it illustrates how the sans-culottes demanded more violence and execution. However the source does not reveal attitudes and opinions of other social groups (aristocracy, bourgeoisie, peasantry etc.), political groups (Girondins etc.) or the provinces and therefore has clear limitations. At Level 4 judgement will be extended and the source’s weaknesses analysed closely. The source is dated 12 November 1793 and reflects strong support from the sans-culottes for the Jacobins’ policy of Terror at that time. By early 1794 even the support of the sans-culottes for the policy of Terror had waned due to the centralisation of the instrument of Terror under the control of Robespierre following the Law of 14 Frimaire, the execution of Hébert, Danton and Desmoulins and the law of 22 Prairial.

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

“It was above all the actions of the mob that accelerated the development of extremism during the years 1789 to 1794.”

Assess the validity of this view.

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

Candidates have a number of issues to consider. Firstly, did the actions of the mob accelerate the development of extremism throughout the period? Secondly, who had the upper hand in the relationship between the sans-culottes and the Jacobins? Thirdly, what was the impact of the war on the revolution: i.e. was Terror and extremism an integral part of the Revolution’s political culture or was the Terror a temporary aberration – a response to extreme circumstances from 1792 onwards?

Evidence from the sources:

Source A – although there is no direct reference to the crowd it is clear that Schama believes that violence and extremism were an integral part of the Revolution’s political culture and therefore the war was not a catalyst for the Terror and extremism post 1792.

Source B – “the Jacobin majority committed itself to an even greater radicalisation of the revolution.” Therefore candidates may use this to argue that from 1792 the Jacobins accelerated the development of extremism by voting in favour of the execution of Louis XVI.

Source C – Since 1789 violence “had tended to come from angry crowds”; candidates may support this with own knowledge of crowd action from 1789, e.g. storming of the Bastille, October Days, storming of the Tuileries, September massacres etc. However Wright clearly sees September 1793 as a turning point, from then on the pace of extremism was forced by the Jacobin government not the crowd, “the Terror was organised and became for the first time a deliberate policy of government”.

Source D – this contemporary evidence clearly illustrates that the radical sans-culottes were clearly in favour of extremist measures and urged the government to go further; “Legislators! Do not spare those vampires who suck the blood of *La Patrie*”.

At Level 1 answers may narrate the actions of the crowd for part or all of the period with no focus on the issue of extremism. Level 2 responses may go on to describe the actions of the crowd in more detail with loose references to extremism and may show a limited understanding of changes in crowd action over time. Level 3, 4 and 5 responses must use both the sources and own knowledge. At Level 3 there will be a clearer understanding of the impact of crowd action on the course of the Revolution and how it fluctuated over time. There will be some definition of the sans-culottes and their changing relationship with the Jacobins and/or a brief examination of the impact of the war on the course of the Revolution. At Level 4 and 5 there will be an explicit understanding of the extent of mob action on the accelerated development of extremism and a greater examination of the relationship between the Jacobins and sans-culottes and how this changed during the course of the war. Candidates will refer to interpretations of the nominated texts and/or other historians to support their argument. Rees and Townson argue that the war was the key factor in forcing the pace of extremism from 1792 onwards and that the policy of Terror was necessary in order to save the Revolution from internal and external enemies. Wright, Rudé and Williams believe that the overthrow and execution of the King (1792–1793) and the removal of the Girondins (June 1793) was a key turning point in the influence of the sans-culottes and that they had now entered into a lucrative partnership with the Jacobins. From 1793 the sans-culottes were able to exert influence on the Jacobin government. They forced the Convention to grant the law of the General Maximum and campaigned for the creation of the revolutionary armies which forced grain requisition and defeated counter-revolution in the provinces. Other historians such as Furet and Richet believe that the sans-culottes were clearly the junior partners in the relationship and exerted very little influence on the Jacobin government and therefore the Terror was created by Robespierre’s political and cultural agenda. At Level 4 and 5 the impact of the war on extremism will be assessed, and the extent to which radicalism and extremism such as the September massacres (1792) emerged as a response to the real and perceived threats to the Revolution: or as part of the *sans-culotte* psychology (as argued by Wright and Williams).