



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative D Unit 4

Mark Scheme

2007 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's 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 specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by A2 level candidates for a number of years.

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

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

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

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

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

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF 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.

C: 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.

June 2007

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

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

Section A: Political Instability in France, 1814–1914

Question 1

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

How fully does **Source A** support the view put forward in **Source B** about the extent to which Louis-Philippe was personally responsible for the downfall of the Orleanist monarchy? (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

Level 1 answers will demonstrate uncontrolled use of the sources and limited recognition of the contrasting views, Source B describes Louis-Philippe as 'grey and dull', Source A describes him as 'dodderly and dithering'. Level 2 answers will demonstrate that both sources have some areas of agreement/disagreement about the responsibility of Louis-Philippe for his own downfall. Both sources refer to positive personal qualities, (Source A) to his courage and willingness to learn from Charles X's mistakes, (Source B) to his shrewdness and political experience. However, Source A is much more positive and clearly argues that Louis-Philippe remained in Paris and adapted his rule to respond to the crisis of 1848 and implies that his downfall was due to circumstances outside his control, whereas Source B claims that Louis-Philippe's personal qualities exposed him to attack from 'hostile cartoonists', which undermined his rule, as did his caution. Level 3 answers will begin to explicitly use own knowledge about the rule of Louis-Philippe and the circumstances surrounding the revolution on 1848 in order to draw conclusions about the extent of his personal responsibility for his downfall. They may refer to the economic and social reasons for the revolution, the events of February 1848 and the impact of Louis-Philippe's decision not to dismiss the Guizot government sooner (Source A). At Level 4 conclusions will be sustained throughout the answer and there will be an attempt to balance evidence from the sources and own knowledge about the responsibility of Louis-Philippe for the downfall of the Orleanist monarchy in the period.

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

‘A lack of strong leadership was the primary cause of political instability in France during the years 1814 to 1914.’

Assess the validity of this statement.

(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 the 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.

A lack of strong leadership and the search for another Napoleon is often cited as a significant contributing factor to the political instability of France in the period 1814–1914. Effective answers should assess the extent to which France did suffer from a lack of strong leadership and consider other factors which contributed to political instability, e.g. social, economic, religious, the conflict between left and right etc.

Evidence from the sources may include:

Source A: Charles X's 'political suicide in 1830' due to an inability to compromise. Counter-argument about the strength of Louis-Philippe's leadership in 1848 when he remained in Paris and proved willing to compromise. This can be dismissed as too little too late.

Source B: despite worthy leadership skills mentioned in this source the rule of Louis-Philippe was undermined by propagandists and he was considered to be a weak leader. This source clearly implies the legacy of Napoleon Bonaparte and France's search for a strong ruler who could lead France back to glory.

Source C: Napoleon III's 'lack of judgement', 'lightweight', 'regime...no solid foundation', clearly argues that the downfall of the Second Empire was due to a lack of strong leadership from Napoleon III.

Source D: 'grey mediocrities', 'weak presidents and governmental instability', however this source also argues that political instability during the Third Republic was an illusion and that strong leadership came from the 'new social strata'.

Evidence to support a lack of strong leadership:

The downfall of the Bourbon monarchy is often linked to the personal failings of Charles X (Source A). Charles X's reactionary government threatened the Charter, by introducing press censorship, dissolving the National Guard and choosing ministers without regard for the chamber or the electoral process. Both Bourbon monarchs were criticised for an unambitious foreign policy. It can be argued that Louis-Philippe lost the throne because of what he did not do, i.e. a lack of social and political reform and an inactive foreign policy, which alienated the middle classes. He faced opposition from Bonapartists, Legitimists and Republicans throughout his rule. The failure of the Second Republic was due to the inability of Republican leaders to unite and oppose the conservative forces. Napoleon III was ultimately responsible for the downfall of the Second Empire due to his foreign policy mistakes, whilst the Third Republic was plagued by presidential and ministerial changes. The Boulanger Affair of the late 1880s represented France's quest to find another 'Napoleonic' figure.

Evidence against a lack of strong leadership:

Louis XVIII died on the throne and ruled with firmness and moderation. It can be argued that Charles X was a strong, if misguided leader. Louis-Philippe remained on the throne for 18 years, survived 6 assassination attempts and 2 attempted coups by Louis-Napoleon. He was a cautious and moderate leader, who was willing to use force to put down social and political unrest, e.g. the army was used to crush the silk weavers revolt of 1831. Louis-Napoleon was able to manipulate the general desire among the population for a strong leader to his advantage in 1848 when he was elected President of the Second Republic and again in his coup of 1851. The economic achievements of Louis-Napoleon were in part due to favourable circumstances, but can also be credited to the stable, if authoritarian political system of the 1850s. Despite appearing to be politically unstable, with a succession of what seemed to be weak and ineffective Presidents, the Third Republic survived for 70 years. The limits to the President's power under the Third Republic were designed to prevent a recurrence of the 1851 coup and there were men of considerable political ability and quality, e.g. Gambetta, Ferry, Waldeck-Rousseau, Déclasse and Poincare. It can be argued that there was political stability of the ruling classes (Source D).

A range of other factors may also be considered as the primary cause of political instability in France. These may include: the political struggle between Left and Right, socio-economic problems, conflict between Church and State, foreign policy etc.

Level 1 responses will tend to assert or describe incidents of weak leadership/political instability. Level 2 responses will demonstrate a limited and at times implicit understanding through descriptive narrative about the extent of a lack of strong leadership on the political stability of France. At Level 3 both the sources and own knowledge must be used to demonstrate a more explicit understanding of the issue of leadership, linked more securely to political instability –

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.

Section B: Nationalism and the State, Europe 1848–1881

Candidates answer **one** question from the following (2–10). 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 almost to 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**

To what extent was the failure of the 1848–1849 revolutions in the Italian states caused by external rather than internal factors? (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 were a number of internal and external factors which led to the downfall of the 1848 Revolutions. Candidates need to discuss the extent to which the revolutionaries were divided and connect these divisions to a lack of decisive action and also discuss the impact of the recovery of conservatism in the form of Austrian and French military power on the defeat of the revolutionaries.

Internal factors

Divisions within the ranks of the Italian revolutionaries include ideological/political divisions owing to the influence of the nationalist writers Mazzini, Balbo and Gioberti. Gioberti and the neo-guelphs' hopes of a united Italy led by the Pope were killed by the refusal of Pius IX to put himself at the head of the nationalist cause. The radical republicanism of Mazzini and the Roman Republic and/or Daniel Manin and the Republic of Venice lacked support from other regions of Italy. Geographical divisions ranged from inter-state rivalry which prevented co-ordination, different aims for different states' uprisings (e.g. Milan and Venetia wanted to overthrow Austrian rule, Sicily wanted independence from Naples and Bourbon rule, whilst the revolutionaries in Naples, Tuscany, Piedmont and the Papal States wanted to secure a more representative and liberal government). The revolutionaries were also divided socially and culturally as they were mainly driven by the middle classes who feared a social revolution and 'mob rule' (illustrated by Ferdinand II staging a successful counter-revolution in Naples) and who had little mass support due to their lack of understanding of the plight of the peasantry. There was a lack of awareness about national identity due to overwhelming illiteracy and scores of local dialects. Although Charles Albert had the superficial appearance of leading the Italian nation in its bid for freedom against Austria, in reality his requirement for allies to submit to Piedmontese control intensified political divisions. Therefore the revolutionaries differed in aims, lacked cohesion and co-ordination.

External Factors

The return of European stability and the swift recovery of the Austrian government ensured the decisive defeat of the Italian Revolutionaries. Within a month conservative forces led by Radetzky claimed victory in Custoza thus subduing all of Lombardy and Venetia (with the exception of Venice). Piedmont was defeated again in 1849 at Novara; and the Austrian Navy destroyed the Republic declared in Venice. The French forces of Louis Napoleon defeated the Roman Republic in June 1849. It is therefore arguable that the key factor in the collapse of the revolutions was the reassertion of conservative military might.

Level 1 responses will possibly narrate the course of the revolutions, or make vague assertions about the failure of the revolutions. At Level 2, responses will examine the failure of the revolutions with little explicit focus on internal or external factors. Level 3 answers will begin to make explicit links between internal and external factors. At Level 4, responses will be balanced and at Level 5 judgement about the key factors in the failure of the revolutions will be made, supported by well selected and wide ranging evidence.

Question 3

Who made the greater contribution to the unification of the Italian states in the years 1848 to 1861, Cavour or Garibaldi? (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

Answers must focus on the contributions of Cavour and Garibaldi to the unification of Italy and assess which individual made the most significant contribution. Cavour is often referred to as the 'architect' of the unification of Italy and Garibaldi the 'sword'. Both played a significant role and answers may choose either figure as the greatest contributor.

Cavour

Cavour was appointed prime minister of Piedmont in 1852 and it can be argued that he played a significant role in the economic modernisation of Piedmont. In the 1850s, he helped create a modern political state with a semi-industrial economy which laid the foundations of the unification process. Under Cavour, the foreign policy of Piedmont firmly placed the 'Italian question' in the general context of European diplomacy. Piedmont's military contribution to the Crimean War, although limited, entitled Cavour to a place at the Congress of Paris in 1856. However, Cavour failed to achieve a diplomatic initiative, but he gained the gratitude of Britain and France, which would be crucial if and when Piedmont were to militarily challenge Austrian rule. Cavour's negotiations with Napoleon secured the Plombieres agreement of July 1858, which ensured French help to drive the Austrians out of Italy. However, Napoleon's betrayal at Villafranca caused Cavour to resign in disgust. Following his return to power in 1860 Cavour manipulated the plebiscites in the Duchies which secured union with Piedmont. Cavour also took action in 1860 to prevent a hostile foreign reaction to Garibaldi's attempt to invade Rome and in 1861 the Kingdom of Italy was proclaimed. However, the extent to which Cavour desired the unification of the whole of Italy can be questioned and it can be argued that he only wanted the expansion of Piedmont in the north of the peninsula.

Garibaldi

Garibaldi played an active role in the 1848–1849 revolutions with the formation of the Roman Republic. He believed in direct action, yet it is very unlikely that direct action alone would have secured that future of unification due to foreign intervention by Austria and France. Garibaldi's invasion of Sicily and Naples in 1860 was very significant as his actions turned the unification of the northern regions into the unification of the whole peninsula.

Level 1 responses will narrate the course of unification. At Level 2 responses may be more descriptive with mainly implicit links to the significance of Cavour and/or Garibaldi. Level 3 answers will have more secure evidence about the contributions of both Cavour and Garibaldi and will begin to make judgements (possibly in the form of a conclusion). Level 4 responses will be balanced with explicit links and secure evidence from across the whole period about the roles of the individuals. Level 5 responses will have clear judgment and a well developed line of argument about the relative contributions of Cavour and Garibaldi to the unification process.

Question 4

‘The Risorgimento after 1861 failed to unite Italy either politically or economically.’
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

Responses need to consider the extent to which Italy was unified in the period 1861–1871 and should consider the distinction between ‘legal Italy’ (the state) and ‘real Italy’.

Evidence to support the view:

The Brigand’s 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, rather than a unified Italy led by Piedmont. Sicily revolted in 1866 against the oppressive rule from the North and conscription. Garibaldi’s failed attempts to take Rome in 1864 and 1867 illustrated the city’s opposition to unification. The process of Piedmontisation intensified the economic and cultural problems of the newly unified Italy. Economically there was a north-south divide, whilst culturally local dialect in the south and widespread illiteracy effectively removed the region from the electorate. The Statuto ensured that the model of strong central government and weak local government prevailed, exacerbating local issues. Piedmont’s imposition of regressive indirect taxation to pay off her huge debts was fiercely resented. The removal of internal trade barriers damaged the already weakened southern economy. Piedmont’s religious laws formally separated Church and State and were seen as an attack on the Catholic Church, intensifying opposition to the State from those in the south.

Evidence against the view:

The war with Austria in 1866 brought about the acquisition of Venice, whilst Italian neutrality in the Franco-Prussia War of 1870 brought about the opportunity to take Rome. Legally, there was great progress made in the unification of the Italian nation. The state’s administrative structure was centralised, Piedmontese taxes, weights and measures and the idea of free trade were imposed on the rest of Italy.

Level 1 answers will assert or narrate Italian unity. Level 2 responses may describe weakness of the newly unified Italy, with little direct focus on events. At Level 3 there will be an explicit understanding and a range of evidence about the lack of Italian unity linked to events. Level 4

responses will be balanced and have a secure range of evidence which is well selected and in some depth. At Level 5, clear judgement will be demonstrated about the extent of Italian unity in the years 1861–1871.

Option B: Russia, 1848–1881

Question 5

To what extent was the repressive nature of Nicholas I's rule, in the years 1848 to 1855, a result of his reaction to external rather than internal threats to his autocracy?

(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

Effective answers need to define external and internal threats to autocracy and then assess which factors contributed the greatest to the repressive rule of Nicholas I in the years 1848 to 1855. Higher level answers will probably conclude that Nicholas I was a firm believer in the protection of autocracy throughout his rule and that the external threat of liberal and nationalist revolution made him even more reactionary and less inclined to consider internal reform. However, external liberal ideas from Western Europe became a significant internal threat to the autocracy of Russia when they were adopted by the Russian intelligentsia as arguments to oppose Tsarist rule.

Evidence to support external threats include:

Superficially, it appears that the period of repression from 1848 was a reaction to the external threats of liberal and nationalist revolution which swept Europe in that year and which challenged Nicholas I's traditional allies of Austria and Prussia. The 1848 Revolutions in Europe, particularly the uprising in Hungary, were of great concern to Nicholas I, due to the state's borders with Poland. Nicholas I believed that the revolutions were the result of 'free-thinking', and he wanted to keep Russia immune from this. Consequently censorship reached new heights. Newspapers were prevented from reporting most foreign news to the general public. Most foreign fiction was condemned. By 1850 there were 12 different bodies to deal with censorship.

Evidence to support internal threats include:

Nicholas I was also very aware that the social and economic conditions in Russia were a breeding ground for social discontent with the regime. There was a severe cholera epidemic and the worst crop failures for thirty years in 1848. Rapid population growth far outstripped any advancements made in farming techniques and the refusal to free the serfs resulted in around 20 revolts per year. More importantly, there was the growth of political opposition to the autocracy from the intelligentsia, including the Westernisers and the Slavophiles. In 1849 the Third Section uncovered the activities of 'The Petrashevsky Circle', who were accused of revolutionary conspiracy despite a lack of evidence. The universities were threatened with

closure and were placed under strict controls. Theology dominated the curriculum, whilst the study of philosophy and European constitutional law was suppressed.

Level 1 responses will either assert the causes of the repressive rule of Nicholas I or narrate the period 1848–1855. At Level 2, answers will be more descriptive about Nicholas I's rule with mainly implicit focus on the internal and external threats to autocracy. At Level 3 there will be some explicit connections made between the internal and external threats to autocracy and how these influenced his repressive policies. Level 4 answers will have a balanced argument about the causes of Nicholas I's repressive rule. Level 5 responses will display clear judgement and secure knowledge.

Question 6

To what extent do the political and social policies of Alexander II entitle him to be known as the 'Tsar Liberator'?

(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

Descriptions of Alexander II's political and social reforms are not in themselves useful. Candidates are required to engage in the debate about the impact of the reforms implemented by Alexander II and the extent to which they freed the population of the Empire from the backward social and political conditions inherited from Nicholas I.

Evidence to support 'Tsar Liberator'

The Emancipation Edict of 1861, in theory, freed the serfs from bondage and allowed them to enter trade and marriage without the permission of the local landowner. The creation of zemstvas and Dumas created a new system of local government. The judicial reform introduced in 1864 was intended to sweep away all the old abuses and set up a system that was fair and just. Equality before the law, an independent judiciary and trial by jury were established. Military reform was the most democratic of all the reforms carried out under Alexander II as it treated all Russians equally. Educational reforms promoted primary education and diluted Orthodox influence. Therefore it can be strongly argued that Alexander II implemented a series of far-reaching reforms.

Evidence against 'Tsar Liberator'

It can be argued that the reforms introduced by Alexander II as 'Tsar Liberator' did not go far enough. They raised the expectations of change without satisfying the aspirations of many Russians. Superficially, reforms such as 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. Emancipation of the serfs created more social and political problems than it solved. Serfs were denied equality with other Russians and were subject to draconian legal measures, whilst redemption payments were crippling. Local government continued to be controlled by the nobility. Able candidates

will argue that the Tsarist system was at odds with political and social reform and that any attempt to 'liberalise' Russia whilst maintaining an unquestionable system of autocracy was bound to subject the regime to harsh and vocal criticism. The growth of political opposition caused Alexander II's reforming zeal to be transformed into a reign of political reaction in the 1860s. Therefore it can be argued that Alexander II's reforms did not go far enough and were 'too little, too late'.

Level 1 answers will superficially narrate the course of Alexander II's reforms. Level 2 answers will have more descriptive detail about Alexander II's reforms, not always focused specifically on political and social. At Level 3, understanding will be demonstrated more explicitly about the implications of 'Tsar Liberator'. Level 4 responses will have a clear and explicit understanding of the positive and negative impact of Alexander II's reforms. At Level 5, judgement will be made about whether Alexander II deserves the title of 'Tsar Liberator'.

Question 7

'The most effective opposition to Alexander II came from the Polish nationalists rather than from the Russian liberal and radical movements.'

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 question requires candidates to compare the effectiveness of different opposition groups to the rule of Alexander II. Candidates may assess lack of effectiveness by examining divisions within the opposition groups and considering the strengths of Tsarist rule, particularly the role of censorship and the secret police.

Alexander II made a series of concessions to Poland in the 1850s which failed to appease the nationalist nobility who staged demonstrations in Warsaw in 1861. Polish nationalists were outraged at the policy of Russification which followed and staged a serious revolt in 1863. The revolt broke out in January 1863 and lasted until August 1864. The revolt failed as the peasantry was unmoved and Russia maintained control of the cities to defeat a disorganised and outnumbered opposition. The revolt did encourage Alexander to introduce a favourable emancipation edict but continued Russification earned him the undying hostility of Polish peasants and landowners. The suppression of the Polish Revolt encouraged the growth of militancy within Russia which resulted in the unsuccessful assassination attempt of 1866.

Liberal and radical groups were, by their very nature, divided ideologically and tactically. The Intelligentsia was divided into the Slavophiles, who rejected western ways, and the Westernisers, who wanted reform to go further. Populists saw the peasantry as the heart of a new society and encouraged education, whereas groups like 'Land and Liberty' and 'People's Will' developed as terrorist organisations. 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.

Opposition groups were 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, radical journals closed down and universities were placed under police supervision.

Level 1 responses will assert the effectiveness of opposition. Level 2 responses will probably describe the different types of opposition faced by Alexander II. At Level 3, the range of evidence will be more secure about Polish nationalism and liberal and radical movements, with some attempt at focus on effectiveness. At Level 4, answers will be balanced, with clear links to the effectiveness of opposition groups in the face of Tsarist repression. Level 5 responses will have a clear and strong line or argument, supported by well-selected evidence.

Option C: The Unification of Germany, 1848–1871

Question 8

‘The failure of the 1848–1849 revolutions in the German states was due to the divisions within the ranks of the revolutionaries rather than to the strength of German conservative forces.’

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

Divisions within the revolutionaries

The revolutionaries were divided politically into radicals, moderates and conservatives. Created by a middle class franchise the Frankfurt Parliament alienated the masses. Representatives of the Frankfurt Parliament were largely moderate and wanted a constitutional monarchy incorporating liberal ideas of limited democracy (e.g. the franchise, fiscal equality, freedom of the press, association and religion). A very small number of conservative representatives wanted to ensure that the Frankfurt Parliament maintained the rights of individual states and did not exercise too much centralised power. Radicals within the Parliament were in a minority but found their demands for a republic and the removal of existing governments at odds with the moderates. Divisions within the revolutionaries rendered the Frankfurt Parliament impotent and its failure to solve working-class problems led to the creation of independent workers’ assemblies who made economic demands against middle-class interests. They requested the limitation of factory production, restrictions on free economic and industrial growth and the protection of the artisan guilds.

The strength of conservative forces

In March 1848, Friederich Wilhelm made concessions to the revolutionaries and thereby kept his throne and bought time for the forces of conservatism to regroup. By withdrawing the army from Berlin he was able to maintain its loyalty and keep it together as a counter-revolutionary force. Supported by the Junkers and the army, Friederich Wilhelm was then able to dismiss the

Prussian Parliament through a *coup d'état* (December 1848) and dictate a constitution. Friederich Wilhelm refused the Crown of Germany, withdrew delegates from the Frankfurt Parliament and ordered Prussian troops to disperse the remainder of the Parliament now based in Stuttgart, thus drawing the revolutions to an end by June 1849.

Level 1 responses will probably give an incomplete narrative of the course of the 1848–1849 Revolutions in the German states. At Level 2 there will be some brief focus on the issues. Level 3 answers will be more explicit in their focus on why the revolutions failed. At Level 4 responses will be balanced and make connections between the failure of the revolutionaries and strength of conservative forces. Level 5 answers will have judgement and a clear line of argument about which factor was the most prevalent in the failure of the revolutions.

Question 9

'Bismarck's success in uniting Germany in the years 1862 to 1871 owed more to his opportunism than to a grand design.'

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 argument that German unification was the 'grand design' of Bismarck the 'master politician and supreme statesman' is now out of favour and he is now considered to be a 'clever opportunist' who was able to exploit the diplomatic and political circumstances in Europe for his own political gain. Other historians emphasise the 'primacy of economics' and argue that Prussian diplomacy was founded upon the economic dynamic.

Evidence for opportunism:

The extent to which Bismarck's diplomacy was pre-planned needs to be considered. He was a very resourceful diplomat, but he was also able to take advantage of opportunities given by his enemies. Danish foreign policy in 1863–1864 was amateurish; Austrian foreign policy between 1864 and 1866 was confused and Napoleon III made disastrous errors of judgement in foreign affairs. The relationships of the European powers in the late 1860s were suited to Prussian expansionism. Britain could not compete with the size of the Prussian army, whilst Russia was still smarting from defeat in the Crimean War and was not willing to support Austria against Prussian aggression.

Level 1 responses may give an incomplete narrative on the unification of Germany. Level 2 will have some descriptive focus on Bismarck's role. Level 3 answers will have some explicit focus on the debate with some secure supporting evidence. At Level 4, arguments will be clear and cohesive for most of the response with a wide range of secure evidence. Level 5 responses will demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and judgement about the extent to which Bismarck pre-planned the unification of Germany.

Evidence for grand design:

Bismarck himself is responsible for presenting himself as a political genius who followed a grand programme which led to German unification under Prussian control. Germany was unified through three victorious wars against the Danes (1864), Austrians (1866) and French (1870). Bismarck's diplomacy was vital for the pretext of conflict and for the isolation of opponents and acquisition of supporters, e.g. Bismarck's diplomacy isolated Austria following the Schleswig-Holstein Crisis before the war with Prussia in 1866 which finally broke Austrian power in Germany and paved the way for a *Kleindeutsch* land solution to the German problem. The handling of the Spanish Candidature Crisis and the editing of the Ems telegram, were explained in Bismarck's memoirs as deliberate strategies to provoke a French declaration of a war they could not win.

Question 10

'The unity of the new German Empire was myth rather than reality.'
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

The unification of Germany was the result of Prussia exerting its dominance over the other German states, not by the result of popular revolution. Therefore it can be argued that the unity of the new German Empire in 1871 was largely in name only and that in reality the new Germany was subject to many social, political and religious divisions. However, it is possible to argue that divisions evident in 1871 were superficial and that Prussian domination of the new empire ensured that any opposition was easily crushed by her superior economic, military and political strength.

Evidence to support the argument that German unity in 1871 was a myth

The new German Empire was incomplete because as a *Kleindeutschland* solution to unification it left many Germans outside the borders of the Reich. There were also many minorities, for example the French in Alsace-Lorraine, Danes in Schleswig and 3 million Poles in east Prussia who regarded themselves as victims of Prusso-German nationalism. The new German Constitution preserved Prussian power because of its majority in the Bundesrat and the Reichstag was denied executive power. The Prussian take-over was opposed, especially in the southern states. The separate kingdoms of Bavaria and Saxony feared for their survival in a Prussian dominated Germany. Left Liberals opposed Bismarck and his destruction of civil rights; for them Prussian nationalism had destroyed individualism. Religious divisions were a major weakness of the new empire. Catholics, represented by the Centre Party, (especially in Bavaria, Polish areas and the Rhineland) were a minority in a Protestant dominated state and suffered persecution (*Kulturkampf*). The small Jewish community was also regarded with hostility and suspicion. Economically, there was an East/West divide, with the East of the new empire dominated by the agricultural land of the Junkers and the West by heavy industry.

Evidence to support the argument that German unity in 1871 was a reality

The *Kleindeutschland* solution to unification had created a more manageable Reich. Prussian political and military power was fully established and the Emperor's position and Bismarck's political standing seemed in 1871 to be beyond any serious opposition. The Zollverein had laid the foundations for German industrialisation and the 20 years prior to unification had witnessed uninterrupted economic and urban growth. The growth of railways (over 11,500 km of track by 1860) ensured quick transportation of goods and communication between states. Unification and the French indemnity encouraged an economic boom, while the newly-gained iron ore of Lorraine stimulated the growth of the heavy industries.

Level 1 answers will make assertions about the myth of unity. At Level 2, candidates will be able to describe some aspects of unity and division. Level 3 responses will have a more secure understanding of myth and reality and will probably have a greater range of evidence about the myth of unity. Level 4 responses will be balanced, with a secure range of evidence and an understanding that the strength of Prussian dominance outweighed any potential divisions. At Level 5 candidates will demonstrate judgement about the extent to which German unity was a myth or reality in 1871.