

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
General Certificate of Education Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the June 2002 question papers

9697 History

9697/1	Paper 1 (Modern European History, 1789 - 1939) [maximum mark 100]
9697/3	Paper 3 (International History, 1945 - 1991) [maximum mark 100]
9697/5	Paper 5 (The History of the USA, c.1840 - 1968) [maximum mark 100]
9697/6	Paper 6 (Caribbean History, 1794 - 1900) [maximum mark 100]

These mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. They show the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. They do not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published *Report on the Examination*.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the *Report on the Examination*.

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

CAMBRIDGE
INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

CONFIDENTIAL
JUNE 2002

GCE A Level

MARKING SCHEME

MAXIMUM MARK : 100

SYLLABUS/COMPONENT : 9697/1

History

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Marking schemes have been issued on the basis of **ONE** copy per Assistant Examiner and **TWO** copies per Team Leader.



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

Paper 1 Marking Notes

[Note: all papers are to be marked using the generic marking bands for source-based and essays questions.]

1 Source-Based Question

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

These answers write about British pre-war policy but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information / evidence to test the given hypothesis. *For example, they will not discuss 'less likely...stronger stance'.* Include in this level answers which use information taken from the sources but only in providing a summary of views expressed by the writers, rather than for testing the hypotheses.

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

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

For example, 'Britain did not take a strong stance. Source A says that the British navy was too weak. Source B shows that Britain did not give sufficient support to France. Source E claims that Britain was dragged into the war by its allies.' Or alternatively, 'Britain did take a strong stance before World War I. Source B shows that the German threat was the greatest danger. Sources B, C and D indicate that Grey, the Foreign Secretary, was trying to use British power to avoid war'.

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

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

For example, 'There is evidence for and against the claim that British policies were an important reason for the growing threat of war. Source A calls for greater expenditure on the navy. Source B tells that Britain was strong enough to stop the Kaiser's plans but Grey did not give France enough support. Source C is an attempt by Grey to settle problems by agreement. Source D blames Germany for the war. Source E claims that Britain was forced to go to war by its allies.'

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

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating

their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

For example, 'Britain's policies were not an important reason why war was likely. Although Source A calls for a larger navy to meet the German threat, the article, from a Conservative journal, probably exaggerated the danger to Britain in 1901 although there was widespread concern about the balance of naval power. Sources B and C show Grey's attempts not to inflame the problems. As Foreign Secretary, he played an important part in making British government policy, which was to support its allies but to dissuade them from taking extreme steps against Germany. The views of the German Ambassador in Source D are interesting because they criticise his own country's policies and he did not interpret British policies as weak.'

L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FIND EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [17-21]

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

For example, (L4 plus) '...However, some sources do show that Britain did not take a strong stance against Germany. Source E is very critical although its value must be suspected because it was written by a German historian who was writing soon after the end of the World War and who would have been hostile to Britain. To some extent Source B shows weakness because Grey recognised that Germany would be stopped if Britain took a stronger line.'

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

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

For example, 'Although there is evidence in the Sources both to challenge and support the claim about British policy, the criticism is mostly unfounded. Source A, a journal article, was written to persuade people that more expenditure on the navy was needed. It describes Germany's ambitions in very emotional terms. There are signs in Source B that Grey was weak but the Source, supported by our other knowledge, shows that he realised the danger on inflaming the situation. Britain's power is clear from this Source. Grey's aim in July 1914 was also to mediate but he was not weak in doing this. He emphasises Britain's commitment to the other members of the Triple Entente. Source D does not show the weakness of British policy but the government's realisation that war would be a catastrophe and the German Ambassador points out that Germany was the greater threat. Source E is

unreliable as the writing of an historian who was trying to justify Germany's entry into the war.

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

For example, 'British policy was not weak but moderate. Source B is a reliable account of an interview between Grey and the French Ambassador and indicates that Germany presented a danger to peace. France, not Britain, seemed weak, depending on British support. This is confirmed by Source C. Grey was repeating the policy of the British government in saying that Britain would be involved if a war broke out but that it wished to secure an agreed settlement. These two key Sources are supported by Source D. Of the two German writers, Lichownowsky is more reliable than Brandenburg, whose intention was to clear Germany of any blame for the war. Even the critical article in Source A does not point to British weakness but was a call for Britain to become even stronger. The growing threat of war arose because of the policies of other countries, such as Germany and Austria, whilst the other members of the Triple Entente were determined not to back down. Britain pursued the most moderate, but not the weakest, policy.'

SECTION B

Essay Questions

- 2 The key issue is the reasons why Napoleon Bonaparte was able to establish a strong autocratic government in France. The question deals with domestic issues and narratives of foreign policy will not be relevant. Statements that Napoleon's foreign exploits made him popular and induced obedience will be valid but can be included without elaboration. Credit will be given when candidates distinguish between the Consulate and the Empire. Many of Napoleon's most important measures were taken after becoming First (1799) and his appointment as Consul for Life (1802). His powers were extensive over central and local government. Officials were appointed rather than elected. Credit will be given when the answers show an understanding of how the system worked. He was personally ambitious and compared well with previous politicians who had been less effectual. Some saw him as the saviour of the revolution, others as a safeguard against its excesses and inefficiency. This ambiguity helped him to establish his own authority. A basic knowledge of internal developments, probably with descriptions of the Code, can merit up to 11-13 marks. Fuller accounts with little explanation can be worth 14-15 marks. 16+ will need more consideration of 'strong and autocratic' Very analytical essays which focus on reasons can be worth 22-25 marks.
- 3 The key issue is the reasons why industrialisation had considerable political and social effects on Europe. Candidates are instructed to refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany. Therefore, answers that show an understanding and knowledge of only one will be liable to a ceiling of 14. Two countries can merit any mark band; the references to a third can be a bonus but will not, of itself, lead to a high mark. For example, good discussions of two countries will be worth more than slight knowledge of three. Among the political effects was the creation of a more powerful urban working class that sought representation. The franchise increased in each country to reflect this. Political parties were based on this group. However, in each country, the traditional social groups continued to exert considerable influence. The industrialised middle class gained political power, often in government, although this was less in Germany than in Britain and especially France. Social effects include urbanisation, the demand for social reform, welfare schemes and growing educational opportunities.
- 4 The key issue is the comparison of Cavour and Mazzini's success in uniting Italy. Examiners will look for a reasonably balanced discussion. 60:40 either way result in any mark band; 70:30 would normally indicate a ceiling of one band lower. However, 11-13 will depend on a basic knowledge and understanding of both. Highly narrative accounts that show an adequate knowledge of each man can be given 11-13; fuller narratives will lead to 14-15. 16+ will require a more deliberate comparison. 19-21 answers will be sound but will miss some possible lines of discussion in the comparison. 22-25 should be firmly based in a comparison of both. Cavour was more realistic than Mazzini, especially in his belief that Italy needed external assistance. His more limited aims, probably to unify only the north around Piedmont, were ultimately more successful than Mazzini's more ambitious plans. The

monarchy, rather than a republic, was a better basis for a united Italy. Cavour saw the need for internal reform before change could be achieved, hence the reorganisation and modernisation of Piedmont. He had a clear view of practical politics. For example he did not wish to alienate the Pope. Candidate should note the death of Cavour in 1861. Discussions of the later period should be brief unless the essays make the link between complete unification and Mazzini's aims.

- 5 The key issue is the reasons why interest in imperialism increased greatly in the later years of the nineteenth century. The pace of change, e.g. the Scramble for Africa, typified this period. International competition sparked off a rivalry in many parts of the world. Strategic interests became a priority. Attitudes among the public and politicians changed. There was money available for investment and a perceived need for raw materials. As Europe fell into protectionism, imperial expansion seemed a method to increase trade and maintain prosperity. Candidates can limit their regions of study as long as the examples are appropriate. The more important aspect is the reasons that are given. Answers in the highest bands, 19-21 or 22-25, will focus on explanation. Vague assertions about imperialism will not be worth 11 marks. 11-13 will require the rehearsal of some basic reasons with a few examples. 14- 15 marks can be awarded to fuller descriptions. Answers in these bands will probably not organise the points into a hierarchy. 16+ will be given for more explanation.
- 6 The key issue is the assessment of the stability of the tsarist regime in Russia from 1906 to 1914. There may well be two broad categories of answer: those that assume revolution in Russia and describe uncritically the problems of the tsarist regime and those that look at the strengths and weaknesses of Nicholas II's government. The second will very probably deserve a higher mark. Narrative of events, perhaps from 1905 or even 1894, which contain little explanation will be worth 11-13 if accurate and 14-15 at most if the narrative is full. 16+ answers will include some consideration of the dangers but may be one-sided. 19-21 essays will appreciate some of the strengths of the regime if they are lop-sided but 22-25 will show good judgement, even if their conclusion is that a revolution was likely. Candidates should take care in dealing with 1914-17. This is strictly outside the terms of the question unless brief reference is made to highlight the situation in 1914. For example, Nicholas II could have survived had it not been for the war. The army was still a powerful support. Nicholas II survived the 1905 Revolution and candidates will assess how far the changes of the October Manifesto etc. safeguarded tsarism. There were riots in Russia but the most determined critics, e.g. Bolshevik leaders, were either exiled or in prison. There were signs that the economy was being modernised. On the other hand, the limited achievements of the Duma showed that Russia was still very much an eastern European autocracy.
- 7 The key issue is the reasons why many Germans supported Hitler and his Nazi dictatorship. Candidates should note the end date of 1939 and avoid accounts of World War II. Whilst most can be expected to cope with the general issue of the popularity of the Nazis, 22-25 should consider specifically dictatorship. This may be implied in an otherwise sound discussion for 19-21. Moderate answers, worth 11-13, will probably include

accounts of the rise of the Nazis with general claims about Hitler. Fuller accounts can be given 14-15. 16+ will need more explanation. For example, Hitler's personal role was important and was enhanced by skilful propaganda. He was a contrast to the weak and apparently corrupt politicians of the Weimar regime. The Nazis aimed to widen their support by appealing to different sectional interests, although in practice some were ignored when in power. Unpopular minorities were attacked, e.g. Jews, gypsies. The inefficiencies of the regime were concealed. The police, Gestapo, Nazi-dominated law courts were not seen as repressive by most because their victims were portrayed as enemies of all Germans. There is no need to provide details of foreign policy beyond bare references but Hitler's assertion of German power gained him support among those who felt that Germany had been betrayed at Versailles.

- 8 The key issue is the extent to which Lenin and Stalin established a Marxist regime in Russia. This is a cross-sectional question and candidates need to be able to bring together knowledge and understanding that otherwise they will have developed separately. 'Marxist' is important and reference is made to it in Section V of the syllabus although examiners will remember the level of understanding that is expected in this examination. Bare successive accounts with no comparison of Lenin and Stalin's government and no reference to Marxism will be liable to a ceiling of 11-13. Fuller accounts with a basic understanding of Marxism will be awarded 14-15. Answers in both of these bands will refer generally to Communism. Up to 21 can be awarded for analyses and comparisons that accept fully that Russia was a complete Marxist state but 22-25 essays should see the limitations in the claim. The dictatorship of the proletariat was a theory rather than a reality under both Lenin and Stalin. Lenin's NEP saw some reversion to capitalism whilst Stalin's economic measures were motivated more by his personal policies than by ideology. However, in both cases, the appeal to ideology was publicised and critics and rivals were denounced as enemies of Marxism in various forms.