

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2010 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9697 HISTORY

9697/13

Paper 1, maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

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

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010	9697	13

GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Examiners will assess which Level of Response best reflects most of the answer. An answer will not be required to demonstrate all of the descriptions in a particular Level to qualify for a Mark Band.

In bands of 3 marks, examiners will normally award the middle mark, moderating it up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer. In bands of 2 marks, examiners should award the lower mark if an answer just deserves the band and the higher mark if the answer clearly deserves the band.

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
1	21–25	The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material and ideas. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The best answers must be awarded 25 marks.
2	18–20	Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided.
3	16–17	Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.
4	14–15	Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively.
5	11–13	Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.
6	8–10	Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.
7	0–7	Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent. Marks at the bottom of this Band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answers usually make at least a few valid points.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010	9697	13

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

SOURCE-BASED QUESTION: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

- 1 'Germany's fears of Russia before World War I were fully justified.'
Use Sources A–E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2–3]	EVALUATION [L4–5]	CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER (e.g. contextual knowledge)
A	Memorandum by an official in the German Foreign Office.	The Reinsurance Treaty between Russia and Germany was not to Germany's advantage but gave more concessions to Russia.	Y – German policy after the fall of Bismarck became disenchanted with the Reinsurance treaty and with policy to Russia in general. Y – Good relations with Russia did endanger Germany's friendship with Austria. N – The Reinsurance Treaty itself was not one-sided. N – Although a memorandum, the source is not objective.	Y – E confirms Russian intentions to attack Germany. Y/N – A indicates the danger to Germany from Russia but Bismarck believed that he had solved the problem by the Reinsurance Treaty. N – C and D disagree in different ways about the need to fear Russia.	Y – Relations between Germany and Russia deteriorated after Bismarck's fall. Y – The key importance of the Austro-German alliances is noted. N – Russia did not have plans for an early war at the end of the 19th century. N – The source misrepresents the balance of advantage in the Reinsurance Treaty.
B	Memorandum by the German Chief of Military Staff to his government.	Russia was not strong militarily and there was no current danger of war. But Russia's military spending would cause danger in the future.	Y – The source is a reasonably accurate description of Russia's military situation in 1912. N – Even in its disorganised state, the Russian army was formidable because of its numbers.	Y – C agrees about the Russian army being unprepared. Y/N – A and B show different views of the Reinsurance Treaty by which Bismarck had tried to defuse fears of Russia. N – E strongly disagrees about Russia's intentions.	Y – Russia's army needed strengthening. Y – Germany feared a future military threat from Russia. N – The source underestimates the danger from Russia even in 1912.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010	9697	13

C	Report by a German diplomat to his government.	The writer reported that Russia was keen on peace for a variety of reasons.	Y – The description of attitudes in Russia is accurate as far as it goes. N – The extract ignores the willingness of Russia to go to war, especially to defend Serbia.	Y – B agrees about Russia's lack of preparedness. Y – Russia's internal situation was uncertain (but candidates are expected to have only a general knowledge of this). N – The source ignores pressures within Russia to back Serbia, by war if necessary.	Y – Russia engaged in negotiations to avoid war. Y – See point in previous column about Russia's internal conditions. N – The Russian Minister of War did not refer to other reasons why his country might go to war, especially the Balkans' issues.
D	Announcement by the Russian Foreign Minister.	The writer wishes to correct erroneous reports and defends Russian policies and actions.	Y – The writer is an authoritative person in Russia. Y – Russia did seek negotiations. Y – The account of Britain's attitude is accurate. N – The intention is to persuade and the extract is not objective.	Y – A sees Russia as the cause of problems. Y – E believes that Russia was responsible for the crisis. Y/N – B does not see Russia as an immediate danger but it was a future threat. N – A German official believes that Russia wanted peace.	Y – The reference to Austria's ultimatum to Serbia and Russia's patronage of Serbia can be explained. Y – Various proposals for mediation can be examined. N – Russian mobilisation was probably crucial in the outbreak of the war. It was seen by Germany as an immediate danger.
E	Speech by the German Chancellor.	Russia caused international tensions. Russia, supported by France, caused the outbreak of war because of its intervention in the Serbian crisis and its mobilisation. Germany sought peace and went to war for defensive reasons.	Y – Russian mobilisation was a key development in causing war to break out. N – The source ignores German provocation to peace before 1914, e.g. Morocco. N – Not only Russia intervened in the Austro-Serbian crisis. Germany intervened by giving Austria vigorous support. N – The purpose of the speech is to win support for war, not to give an objective account.	Y – B agrees about the long-term danger from Russia. N – C and D disagree. Y/N – A shows the potential threat to Germany from Russia but Bismarck aimed to control it.	Y – Russian support for Serbia and its mobilisation were decisive. N – The source is a very one-sided account of the diplomatic developments before the outbreak of World War I.

NB: These responses indicate only one way to analyse and evaluate the passages. Alternative arguments can be proposed, as long as they are soundly based.
Key: Y & N, i.e. the source supports or challenges the hypothesis.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010	9697	13

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

RUSSIA AND GERMANY BEFORE WORLD WAR I

1 Source-Based Question

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

These answers write generally about the causes of World War I but will ignore the key issues in the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information / evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss 'Germany's fears of Russia before World War I were fully justified.' but might make only general points about the causes of the war. Include in this level answers which use information taken from the sources but only in providing a summary of views expressed by the writers, rather than for testing the hypothesis.

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

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

For example, 'The claim that Germany's fears of Russia before World War I were fully justified is true. Source A shows that Bismarck's policy towards Russia had failed and that his Reinsurance Treaty put Germany at a disadvantage. Germany was restricted in the action it could take and Russia had the initiative. There was a danger that Russia would declare war soon. Source E describes the long-term plans of Russia, which were not peaceful but aggressive. Meanwhile, Germany pursued peaceful policies and mobilised its army reluctantly.'

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 Germany's fears of Russia before World War I were fully justified. [In addition to L2], Source B, supported by Source C, describes the military weakness of Russia before World War I. Although B adds that Russia would be a threat in the future, it did not present a danger at that time. C describes opinion in Russia just before the war broke out. Russia preferred to negotiate and concerns about its internal conditions made the government very nervous about the prospect of war. Source D confirms Russian anxiety to reach a settlement.'

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010	9697	13

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

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

For example, 'It is more accurate to conclude that Germany's fears of Russia before World War I were fully justified. Source B is pro-German but shows the way in which the German attitude to the Reinsurance Treaty quickly changed. Although B and C show that both a leading German general and the Russian Minister for War believed that Russia was reluctant to go to war, each source is of limited value because of its omissions. Germany, as in B, did fear Russia's growing military strength but it ignores the pressure within Russia to take a stand to defend Serbia. Source C is probably an accurate summary of a leading Russian minister's views about the military situation and internal conditions, but it also underestimates the Russians' willingness to back Serbia, even if this involved war. E is the strongest evidence to support the claim. The source is very one-sided and ignores Germany's responsibility for the war. However, it makes the valid point that Russian mobilisation was an immediate short-term cause of World War I.'

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

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

For example, (L4 plus) '...However, the sources can also be interpreted to show that Germany's fears of Russia before World War I were not fully justified. Source A demonstrates the exaggerated fears of the German government. Sources B and C support each other in pointing out Russia's military weakness, which shows that Germany's fears were unjustified. Although Source D is not objective, it probably does reflect the unease of some people in Russia about an impending war. Source E can be dismissed because its purpose is not to give an objective account of relations between Germany and Russia but to defend Germany's decision to go to war.'

- 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 that Germany's fears of Russia before World War I were fully justified, the stronger claim is that the German fears were justified. From Source A, it can be seen that Germany realised that the policy of friendship with Russia would not work because it threatened to cut off Germany from Austria, its main ally. In spite of Russia's military weakness, shown in Sources B and C, Russia still had a very large army with a vast population from which to draw recruits. Russia was determined to support Serbia. E is probably correct in its claim that Germany preferred to localise the Balkans crisis in 1914 but this was unrealistic and Germany itself interfered to strengthen Austria's determination to take vigorous action against Serbia.'

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010	9697	13

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

For example, 'An alternative explanation is that both countries can be blamed for exaggerating the threat from the other. Germany faced a country that lacked a modern army but it feared that Russia would overtake it within a few years. Russia did not take enough steps to defuse the situation and its decision to mobilise its army was the final step that caused war. However, both countries also had other fears that helped to bring about war. Russia feared Austria, as the great enemy of Serbia and other small countries in the Balkans. Germany feared that Russia would join its allies in the Triple Entente. France was seeking revenge for its defeat in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. It also feared that Britain would support Russia. A quick knock-out blow against Russia was therefore planned with the Schlieffen Plan in the west to isolate Russia militarily.'

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010	9697	13

SECTION B

2 Why did the summoning of the Estates General in 1789 not solve the problems of the *ancien régime*?

This question enables candidates to explain the background to the 1789 crisis in France and discuss reasons for the Estates General's failure to solve the problems of the *ancien régime*. There is no specific end-point. Candidates can end in 1789 but will probably need to go further. However, 1793 will be the last possible point and answers might well conclude before that. The question asks 'Why?' and candidates should provide a series of reasons. However, the question can be tackled chronologically because factors changed during the relevant period. The crisis in 1789 was seen as serious but not revolutionary. There were high hopes that the Estates General would result in reforms that would solve the problems of the *ancien régime*. France had severe financial problems; the costs of government had risen and so had its debts. France was potentially wealthy but the fiscal system was inefficient. Privilege meant that costs fell unduly harshly on the middle and lower classes with exemptions for the Church and nobility. The legal system benefited the privileged at the expense of the same middle and lower classes. The *cahiers* demanded an end to such privileges. The powers of the monarchy were extensive but absolutism did not mean dictatorship. Louis XVI was restrained by tradition and also by practical factors. He was weak personally, although not as uninterested in government as has sometimes been claimed. He was prone to give in to pressures that were usually reactionary, for example in the choice of finance ministers. Whilst support for a republic was negligible, there was a wider feeling that the monarch should be governed by some constitutional principles. Louis XVI had no clear ideas about the programme that the Estates General should follow and was disconcerted when faced by its demands, initially for a revision of the voting system. It was symptomatic that there were no agreed procedures for the institution, perhaps not surprising since it had not met since 1610. The Estates General allowed representatives from scattered provinces to speak with one voice. The nobility and Church hierarchy urged the King to refuse any concessions. Candidates can explain how the situation became more volatile in Paris and in many provinces; the Bastille was stormed whilst the peasants invaded many of the chateaux and lands held by the nobility, leading to the Grand Peur / Great Fear. The Tennis Court Oath was followed by the declaration of the formation of a National Assembly, the first of a series of more radical constitutional proposals that Louis XVI first refused and then accepted reluctantly. The Civil Constitution showed the unpopularity of the Church. The situation quickly became more complex as radical groups vied to express more extreme opinions and win support. Paris was largely influenced by the *sans-culottes*. From 1792 war pitched the revolutionaries against other monarchies and made a settlement even more impossible. The way was open for the Jacobins and the end of the monarchy, showing the complete failure of the meeting of the Estates General to solve France's problems.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010	9697	13

3 Assess the social impact of the Industrial Revolution on Europe to the end of the nineteenth century. (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is the social impact the Industrial Revolution. Candidates are asked to refer to at least two countries. The mark will not depend on whether two or three are used as examples. Britain will almost certainly be one of the choices and examiners will not require an even balance. Band 5 (11–13) will need a basic understanding of the developments in one country, probably Britain. The interpretation of social change can be wide but the factors that are examined need to be linked, if only indirectly, with social issues. For example, accounts of technical changes can be included but need to be connected with their impact on society. However, candidates are sometimes uncertain about the difference between social and economic factors and examiners will use their judgement about the value of sections on economic change. For example, the economic importance of the middle classes had social implications. The Industrial Revolution tended to break down traditional class systems although the change was variable in extent and speed across the three countries. Whilst the urban working class and middle class became more important, the traditional aristocracy still maintained its prestige, even in Britain. On the other hand, the rural lower class found that their social conditions often deteriorated. There is an argument about the impact on standard of living but industrialisation may well have resulted in the availability of more consumables for many poor people, as well as the better off. On the other hand, mechanisation could harm the social conditions of small independent workers and manufacturers. Social hierarchies became less insulated and even some of the poor in towns rose to the middle class if they were enterprising and lucky. Changes in transport made travelling easier. Urbanisation brought poor housing – but perhaps not worse than the conditions of the poor in rural areas. There were some improvements in health and education by the end of the nineteenth century.

4 Why was Bismarck a successful leader of Prussia during the period from 1862 to 1871?

The key issue is the reasons why Bismarck became a successful leader of Prussia. The question asks 'Why..?' and the most successful answers in Band 1 (21–25), and most of those in Band 2 (18–20), will be analytical. However, examiners will not underestimate answers that are organised chronologically as long as the chronology is underpinned by an explanation of reasons. He was successful because he recognised that the increase of Prussia's power depended on the weakening of Austria. Austria was strong as the leader of the German Confederation but he believed that it could not lead a struggle against liberalism. He was able to take a broad view, aware of the importance of very different factors, for example 'blood and iron'. He renewed the Zollverein and agreed a free-trade treaty with France but excluded Austria. He managed to persuade, rather than force, other German states to accept the primacy of Prussia. German Liberals were reassured by the formation of the North German Confederation in 1866 because it included a parliament elected by universal suffrage. This hid the continuing influence of the Prussian monarchy and therefore the authority of Bismarck. He was determined and willing to take risks, as when he pushed through the army budget against the opposition of the Liberals in Prussia. Whether or not he conceived a grand design or whether he was an opportunist can be argued by candidates. In either scenario, he was adept at taking advantage of opportunities. This is seen in the three wars in which he involved Prussia, with Austria against Denmark (1864), against Austria (1866) and against France (1870). He was an able diplomat and managed to make his adversaries seem the aggressor in each case. He persuaded other countries to remain neutral: Britain, France and Italy in 1866 and Austria in 1870. It might be claimed that he was lucky. The victories against Austria (Sadowa / Königgratz) and France (Sedan) were crushing but quick victories had not been anticipated. He was lucky in the circumstances that led to the Danish and French wars; the issue of the Hohenzollern candidature and the bungled French reaction could not have been anticipated.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010	9697	13

- 5 Analyse the reasons why the possession of overseas empires was important to major European governments from c.1870 to 1900. (You should refer to developments in *at least two* of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is the reasons for the importance of imperial possessions. Candidates should provide a series of reasons, analyse their nature and assess their importance. Candidates are asked to use at least two countries as examples but there is no requirement to give equal attention to each of the selected countries. Credit will be given for the use of overseas examples and such examples will be necessary to reach Band 2 (18–20) or Band 1 (21–25). Economic reasons include the search for raw materials (e.g. cotton, silk, rubber, oils and precious metals), the expectation that colonial possessions would provide markets and areas of investment for surplus capital. National prestige was important. This was an important factor not only for major countries such as Britain, France and Germany but also for smaller states such as Italy. Strategic interests were seen as linked to imperial possessions. Control of regions was important to prevent them being dominated by other European powers. European diplomacy was subsumed into world events. Candidates might discuss Social Darwinism. Missionary activity might have started through the concerns of individuals and groups but their activities drew governments to establish colonies and development colonial policies. This was particularly important in Africa. Some hoped that overseas empires would be a solution for unemployment in Europe; this proved illusory. Migrants who sought better lives preferred to go to the USA, South America or the British white dominions. Conditions in Africa and the Far East were not conducive to the integration of masses of Europeans. Some candidates might discuss the importance of 'the man on the spot', people such as Rhodes and Carl Peters who blazed trails that governments were forced to follow.

- 6 How far was Nicholas II personally responsible for the problems of the Tsarist regime in Russia from 1905 to 1914?

The key issue is the personal responsibility of Nicholas II for the problems of his regime. 'How far..?' invites candidates to consider alternative explanations and answers in Band 1 (21–25) and Band 2 (18–20) to discuss other reasons for the problems of Tsarism. However, no particular balance is expected in answers; this will depend on the weight of the argument. 1914 is given as the end date and discussions of the period from 1914 to 1917 cannot be given credit unless they are included briefly in an introduction or conclusion. Candidates can discuss Nicholas II's personality. He was indecisive and prone to depend too much on advice from others, particularly the more reactionary, these including Pobedonostev and Alexandra, his wife. He was remote and had little understanding of what was happening in Russia. His prevailing instinct was to oppose change. Whilst appointing some reforming ministers such as Witte and Stolypin, he gave them little support. Ministers were preoccupied with maintaining their positions rather than governing well. He was not interested in reforming the administration, mostly headed by people who were appointed because of their compliance rather than their ability. Persuaded to grant the October Manifesto with a Duma after the 1905 Revolution, he immediately issued the Fundamental Laws (1906) which emphasised autocracy. He gave no support to the Duma and agreed with those who wished to limit its activity, including interfering in elections. Overall, whilst Russia was changing during these years, he wished for continuity. On the other hand, it can be argued that many, or even most, of the problems were outside his control. Russia was backward socially and economically. He was not personally responsible for defeat in the war against Japan (1904–05). The Russian army and navy was weakened by years of neglect and complacency. The 1905 Revolution was not aimed at him personally because most of the protestors were confident that he would improve matters if he were made aware of them. The economic situation that he inherited was poor but, it can be argued, was improving at the beginning of the twentieth century. The social system was deeply embedded in Russia and the forces of reaction far outweighed those who advocated reform. The size of Russia might be pointed out and it included regions that were very different, some with strong nationalist tendencies. The only groups that

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010	9697	13

were keen to change were the middle classes but they were small in number. The peasantry was conservative, as was the aristocracy. The police were widespread but not very effective. Although many were prosecuted and sent to internal or external exile, the police system failed to halt the spread of dissident ideas. For example, Lenin was in exile for most of this period but managed to keep in contact with sympathisers within Russia and to distribute pamphlets and newsletters. Candidates can discuss the outbreak of World War I. Nicholas II was in charge of foreign policy but it can be argued that he was swept along by the popularity of a policy to protect the Serbs.

7 Explain the similarities and differences in the economies of Nazi Germany and the USSR in the 1930s.

The key issue is the comparison of the economies of Nazi Germany and the USSR in the 1930s. Examiners will look for a reasonable balance between the two countries. 60:40 can merit any mark band whilst 70:30 either way might deserve one band lower than would otherwise be given, although the priority as always in awarding a mark will be the quality of the argument. Examiners will not expect a balance between similarities and differences. For example, it is possible to argue that, although there some similarities, the systems were substantially very different. Band 5 (11–13) will need an acceptable knowledge and understanding of one system. Candidates are most likely to achieve a high mark when they adopt a comparative approach, dealing first with similarities and then with differences. Examiners will use their judgement when the answers are in two consecutive parts with a brief comparison at the beginning or, more usually, the end. In both countries, the state (that is the ruling party or even the ruler) was prescriptive about the economic structures that were followed. Neither state was democratic and this meant that there were either no democratic economic decisions, as in the USSR, or few, as in Germany. Economic structures were important elements of a totalitarian government. Central direction was paramount. The Four-Year and Five-Year Plans in Germany and the USSR respectively might be discussed. The workers had no rights independent of the state. Trade unions were merely a façade for state-controlled organisations, for example the Labour Front in Germany. The role of these was to support not modify, even less to oppose, state policies. A common feature was the emphasis on industrialisation which was designed to serve the interests of the state. Nazi Germany saw much investment in armaments and in public works that reflected well on the regime. In the USSR, Stalin was determined to make a quick leap forward in modernisation. Among the differences were the approaches to agriculture. Stalin's USSR was ruthless in its determination to reform the agricultural system through collectivisation. In Germany, there were few changes to the system of ownership in spite of the creation of government cartels. Private enterprise was allowed in Germany and many businessmen were supporters of the Nazi Party because of the opportunities that it gave them. Hitler modified the Party's former adherence to socialist programmes. His regime has been described as a mixture of state capitalism and state socialism. Private enterprise disappeared from the USSR when Stalin abandoned Lenin's NEP. All citizens became employees of the state. The question asks about economic structures but some candidates might also assess success and failure. This can be given credit although it will not be a requirement for any band.

Page 12	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010	9697	13

8 Which was the more significant for nineteenth-century Europe: Liberalism or Imperialism?

The key issue is the comparison of the significance of Liberalism and Imperialism. Marks in Band 1 (21–25) or Band 2 (18–20) will require a reasonable balance of at least 60:40. Band 5 (11–13) will need a basic understanding of one of the factors. The comparison does not need to be continuous or thematic. Successive assessments with a strong introduction and / or conclusion can deserve a high mark. The syllabus topic on New Imperialism gives a starting date of 1870. Candidates will not be expected to display knowledge and understanding of earlier periods although relevant references will be given credit. Liberalism was based on a belief in the freedom of citizens, extending to the franchise, government, speech, religion and trade (although few candidates might mention this). Britain might be used as an example of a country that was comparatively Liberal in the nineteenth century. The early years of the French Revolution saw liberal demands reflected in the Declaration of the Rights of Man. Liberalism might be seen in the watchwords of liberty, equality and fraternity. However, the course of the Revolution to 1799 and then Napoleon's regime showed Liberalism in retreat. From 1815, the reaction to the French Revolution and to Napoleon saw autocracy in the ascendancy, but Liberals continued to press for change. From 1815, the rest of the nineteenth century saw a series of gains and losses for Liberalism in France. Liberal movements emerged in Germany but 1848 saw the limited achievement of Liberalism at that point. Bismarck was hardly Liberal when unifying Germany and governing the new German Empire. In Italy, Liberalism might be identified with Mazzini, to a lesser extent with Cavour and Garibaldi. The syllabus does not include a study of Italy after 1871. Some might refer to Russia as an illiberal state. Imperialism had political, military and economic significance for Europe – or at least for some European countries. It became an element in the balance of power and changed economic patterns. On the whole, Liberalism's effects were mostly internal or domestic whereas Imperialism had both domestic and external repercussions.