

GCE 2004  
*June Series*



## Mark Scheme

### History Alternative D Units 1, 4 and 6 *(Subject Code 5041/6041)*

---

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 from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA  
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

#### 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.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester, M15 6EX.

*Dr. Michael Cresswell Director General*

---

**CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:****AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners**

---

**A: INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS****Level 1:**

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

**Exemplification/Guidance**

Answers at this level will

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

**Level 2:*****Either***

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

***Or***

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

**Exemplification/Guidance**

*Either* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

*Or* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

**Level 3:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

**Level 4:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

**Level 5:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

**C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS**

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

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

**Level 1:***Either*

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

*Or*

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

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

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

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

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

**Level 2:***Either*

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

*Or*

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

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

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

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

**Level 3:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

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

**Level 4:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

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

**Level 5:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

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

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



**D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL**

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

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

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

So, is the response:

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

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

**June 2004****Alternative D: Revolution, Conservatism and Nationalism in Europe, 1789-1914****AS Unit 1: Revolution and Conservatism in France and Europe, 1789-1825****Question 1**

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

Explain briefly the significance of “the Holy Alliance” in the context of Great Power co-operation after 1815. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. limited reference to an international agreement perhaps with some mention of participants named in Source A (Russia, Austria, Prussia). 1

- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. “brotherhood of Christian sovereigns” and context of European co-operation post 1815. The Holy Alliance joined the conservative powers (Russia, Austria and Prussia) in opposition to revolution and liberalism in Europe, the Troppau Protocol of 1820 further reinforced this. The significance of the Alliance was that it reinforced the ideological cleavage between the liberal West and reactionary East and contributed to the breakdown of the Congress System. 2-3

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

Explain how **Source B** challenges the view point put forward by **Source A** of Alexander I’s aims within the Holy Alliance 1815-1818. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.2, AO2*

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

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. very brief reference to the more favourable view of Alexander I in Source A because of his aim for peace and the more critical view of the Tsar in Source B. 1-2

- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. to develop the contrasting views of Alexander I. Source A

refers to Alexander as “on a mission to bring peace and harmony to Europe”. In Source B, Metternich saw Alexander as “the most serious threat to the peace of Europe”. Own knowledge to support the view of Source A could include evidence that the whole of Europe was invited to sign the Holy Alliance, or develop Alexander I’s foreign policy aims. In support of Source B the fears of Austria at Aix-la-Chapelle could be developed. Austria feared that Russian troops would be mobilised across Europe to put down revolution, increasing Russian influence. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. as Level 2, but more detailed use of the sources and developed awareness of contrast. In Source A, Alexander I is portrayed as a peacemaker who compromises with other nations, as the Holy Alliance was “partially rewritten by Metternich”. In Source B, he is accused of using the Holy Alliance to “extend Russian power” which is undermining Great Power co-operation. This however can be seen to have arisen from the perceived fears of the other powers rather than from the actions of Alexander I. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of the mistrust towards Russia, in relation to other factors, in explaining the failure of the Great Power to co-operate effectively in the period 1815 to 1825. **(15 marks)**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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

L2: ***Either***

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

***Or***

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

***Or***

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

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

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

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

### **Indicative content**

Other factors (e.g. ideological disagreements between East and West, the lack of a ‘Congress System’, the inflexible approach and self-interest of all members, the dominance of Metternich) clearly contributed to the Great Powers’ failure to co-operate in the period and these may dominate in candidate answers. However, some focus must be given to the mistrust towards Russia and its impact on Great Power co-operation in answers awarded Level 3 and above.

#### *Evidence from the sources to support mistrust towards Russia:*

Source A: Holy Alliance of 1815 was signed by Austria, Prussia and Russia – Britain refused to sign, the other powers only signed after the Alliance was “partially rewritten by Metternich”, implying that Russia’s version was not to be fully trusted.

Source B: Alexander I “was suspected of intending to pursue policies of his own” in 1818, Austria’s mistrust of Russian power referred to.

Source C: Metternich’s fears Russia might “damage the anti-revolutionary stance of the eastern Powers” and exploit Ottoman weaknesses by “expanding into the Turkish Empire”.

The other Great Powers viewed Russia with mistrust due to the traditional aim of Russian foreign policy, which was to expand westwards and to take advantage of the unstable nature of the Ottoman Empire. The Holy Alliance (A) was widely dismissed by Alexander I’s contemporaries as “a piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense”. Initially this mutual mistrust encouraged co-operation between the powers. Britain and Austria worked closely together between 1815-1820 to control Russia’s expansionist aims. At Vienna (1815) with the support of France they aligned against Alexander I Polish designs, they initially opposed Russia’s plan to include France in the Quadruple Alliance and at Troppau (1820) they opposed Russia’s call for ‘authorised intervention’ in Spain.

Effective co-operation between the Great Powers decreased following the signing of the Troppau Protocol in November 1820. This effectively ended any flexibility within the ‘Congress System’ and removed the common and uniting factor of a mistrust of Russia, which had enabled the liberal and conservative powers to co-operate. From 1820 the Great Powers were increasingly ideologically divided.

Perhaps the most important reason why the European States failed to co-operate effectively was due to lack of a ‘system’. Meetings were called on an ad-hoc basis and there was no permanent organisation to prepare an agenda or establish rules of conduct. The role of Metternich is also important in understanding why co-operation was not that effective. Metternich persuaded the Great Powers to adopt an inflexible and static approach to the preservation of peace and stability in Europe. His methods included the repression of rather than the granting of concessions to liberal or nationalist groups. This lack of flexibility meant that the different views of the Great Powers could not be accommodated; this was particularly visible during the revolts in Spain, Naples and Greece. The attitude of Castlereagh and later Canning also contributed to ineffective co-operation as they increasingly sought to withdraw Britain from the affairs of Continental Europe and pursue British interests.

Level 1 answers will be excessively generalised and incomplete about the failure of the Congress System. Level 2 will be more descriptive/assertive about the failure of the Congress System with probably little/no focus on the mistrust towards Russia. In answers at Level 3 understanding of the mistrust towards Russia may be illustrated through reference to the sources with reference to a limited range of other factors why the Great Powers failed to co-operate. At Level 4 answers will be balanced, have reference to the sources and attempt to prioritise the reasons why the Great Powers failed to co-operate. At Level 5 there will be judgement demonstrated by either a clear priority given to factors and/or understanding of the signing of the Troppau Protocol as a turning point in relations between the Great Powers.

## Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by the term “republic” in the context of the French Revolution. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. brief reference to government without a monarch. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. reference to the abolition of the monarchy, the execution of the King and the concept of representative government. Understanding that the first republic alienated many French citizens as it became synonymous with Jacobinism, Robespierre and the Terror. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why, following the King’s flight to Varennes in June 1791, France became a republic in September 1792. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. incomplete narrative description of events between the flight to Varennes and the abolition of the monarchy. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. understanding of more than one factor explaining why France became a republic. General points include: the increasing unpopularity and general feeling of mistrust towards the King following his flight to Varennes, the impact of military defeat during the war and the growing power of the Cordeliers and Jacobin political clubs, supported by the increasingly radical *sans-culottes*, who campaigned for the deposition of the King. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. Louis XVI renounced the revolution prior to his flight to Varennes and brought into question the role of the constitutional monarchy. The King’s personal popularity decreased even further when he used his power to veto two laws concerning refractory priests and émigrés and to dismiss Girondin ministers. His

action led to the first storming of the Tuileries. The impact of war was a very important factor in the overthrow of Louis XVI. The King saw the war as a means of defeating the revolution and restoring his absolutist powers. Rumours circulated France that the country's foreign policy was being run by an 'Austrian Committee' headed by Marie Antoinette. The war also saw the granting of the vote to passive citizens in July 1792, which increased the political potential of the *sans-culottes*. The issuing of the Brunswick Manifesto by the Austro-Prussian army (1 August 1792) turned the tide of public opinion against the monarchy and increased the radicalism of the *sans culottes*. Another important factor was the actions and growing power of the political clubs. The Jacobin leader Robespierre carefully timed his calls for the complete overthrow of the monarchy and cleverly exploited the increasingly radical mood of the *sans-culottes*. Ultimately it was the actions of the storming of the Tuileries on 10 August 1792 by the *sans-culottes* which led to the imprisonment of the King and the declaration of the republic by the Convention on 21 September. **6-7**

- (c) "By 1794 the Revolution had completely transformed France politically."  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. (15 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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

### **Indicative content**

France experienced fundamental political changes between 1789-1794, the most significant being the abolition of the monarchy and the declaration of the Republic in 1792. Most candidates will therefore agree with the statement; however there must be some attempt at

balance for Level 4 and above. Higher level answers will recognise that although the political institutions of France changed during 1789-1792 the period of the Terror 1792-1794 ensured that political power once again rested in the hands of a small and autocratic minority who restricted individual liberty and political freedom of choice.

#### *Examples of political transformation*

The most striking political change was witnessed in 1792 when France was proclaimed a republic and the institution of the monarchy was abolished; however there was significant political change before this. The August Decrees 1789 marked the end of noble power and privileges. The ‘feudal’ system was abolished, direct (e.g. *taille* and *vingtième*) and indirect taxes (e.g. *gabelle*) were removed and the principle of fair taxation was established. The Declaration of the Rights of Man 1789 laid down the principles on which the new constitution of France was to be based; it guaranteed basic freedoms and stressed the importance of an elected assembly. The work of the Constituent Assembly dismantled the *ancien regime* and brought about the most lasting political changes. A constitutional monarchy was established, the right to vote was given to ‘active citizens’ (61% of men), local government was reorganised and decentralised, a single legal system was established and new law courts replaced the old parlements and feudal courts. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was enforced and the Church lost the tithe and land.

#### *Limits to political transformation*

More able candidates will demonstrate understanding of the limits of political transformation. Evidence may include: the disenfranchisement of the majority of the population due to the property qualification, government restricted to a privileged minority (especially during the period of the Jacobin Terror).

Level 1 answers will make vague assertions about how the revolution transformed France. At Level 2 answers will be more descriptive about a limited range of political transformation, e.g. monarchy to republic. At Level 3 there will be a brief attempt to qualify the extent of political change. Level 4 answers will be balanced and at Level 5 judgement about the extent of political transformation will be expressed.

### **Question 3**

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “titles and honours” in the context of Napoleon’s rule. (3 marks)

#### *Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. brief reference to buying loyalty and support. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. linked to the source and the context of Napoleon’s rule. Reference to one or more of the following, the Legion of Honour (95% of which were awarded to military men), senatoreries, and the Imperial nobility as examples of personal patronage securing support, consolidating power and reducing opposition from the groups in society who could potentially undermine Napoleon’s authority. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Napoleon was successful in maintaining support for his regime in France in the years 1799 to 1804. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. may use the source to illustrate how Napoleon bought loyalty. Brief reference to propaganda, military success, Napoleon's political skill, but will not give detail or explain how these maintained support. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. explaining how Napoleon maintained support. Develops references to more than one of the following: government patronage, propaganda and/or censorship, Napoleon's political skills and personal popularity, the work of the Prefects and police eradicating opposition, economic policies, successful military campaigns, popular domestic policies e.g. education, the Concordat, codification of the law etc. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. factors as Level 2 but more detailed comment and explanation. Candidates who challenge the idea of 'success' in the maintenance of support are Level 3. Evidence may include apathy towards the regime, rather than widespread popular support, the existence of opposition groups (small and often ineffective due to the work of Fouche's Ministry of Police) such as the *Ideologues* based in Paris, royalists and underground groups often made up of Italian immigrants. The most popular form of opposition to the regime was resistance to conscription and desertion. **6-7**

- (c) "Napoleon's rule of France in the years 1804 to 1814 was one of bold, new ideas." Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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



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

### Indicative content

Napoleon's period of rule did introduce some bold new ideas, e.g. Code Napoleon, however he also reintroduced some traditional forms of ruling France. Candidates are more likely to disagree with the statement however there must be some attempt to focus on "bold new ideas" for Level 3 and above.

#### *Evidence of new ideas:*

It can be argued that Napoleon's rule had little in common with the *ancien regime*. Napoleon's ideas and reforms laid the administrative foundations of a modern France, with its enormous power over the lives of the individual and the ability to decide the fate of the local community, was a far cry from the chaotic government of the Bourbons. The Code Napoleon was a new idea, which simplified the unified the laws of France. He introduced a new kind of personal rule, which broke with the traditions of the absolute monarchy, which can be claimed to be the forerunner of twentieth century totalitarian dictatorship.

#### *Evidence of traditional practices:*

Napoleon is often described as the 'destroyer of the Revolution' and to some extent he revived elements of the *ancien regime* in order to consolidate and preserve his power. The Council of State was a revival of the old Royal Council (but under a more acceptable name). The reintroduction of the hereditary title basically made the Consulate into a monarchy, whilst the 1804 coronation had all the pomp and ceremony of the *ancien regime*. Executive power lay in the hands of Napoleon alone, reminiscent of the powers of the absolute monarchy. The Concordat ensured that the Catholic Church was a pillar of the Napoleonic Regime. The provincial administration was once again centralised as it had been under the Bourbons and the Prefects were often likened to the *intendants* (local royal officials). The creation of the Imperial Nobility (1808) reinforced patronage, the decree of which referred to the people of France as 'subjects' not 'citizens'. The Criminal and Penal law code, restriction of liberty, censorship and the police state were based upon practices of the *ancien regime*. Education for the common people and females was neglected by Napoleon, just as it had been under the Bourbon monarchy.

At Level 1 answers are likely to make undeveloped statements about Napoleon's rule. At Level 2 agreement with the statement will be inferred through a description of Napoleon's policies. Level 3 answers will demonstrate a brief understanding of the "son of the Revolution" debate. At Level 4 answers will be balanced and refer to a range of new ideas and traditional practices that were utilised by Napoleon. At Level 5 judgement will be demonstrated about Napoleon as an opportunistic ruler who used a combination of old and new ideas to keep power for himself.

**June 2004****Alternative D: Revolution, Conservatism and Nationalism in Europe, 1789-1914****A2 Unit 4: Nationalism and the State, Europe 1814-1914****Question 1**

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

Explain what is meant by “anti-clericalism” in the context of Church-State relations under the Third Republic, 1871-1914. (5 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. brief, undeveloped reference to attacks on the Church, narrative on the Dreyfus case. 1
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge, e.g. use of the source to comment on how anti-clericals attacked Church privileges, were supporters of the Republic and wanted the separation of the Church and State. Own knowledge could develop the groups in society who were supporters of anti-clericalism (Drefusards, Radical Republicans, Socialists, individuals like Ferry, Waldeck-Rousseau, Combes etc). 2-3
- L3: As L2, with developed reference to both the source and own knowledge, e.g. more developed definition of anti-clericalism as an attack on Church influence and power. The Church in 1871 was still closely connected to the State, through the appointment and payment of bishops and priests by the Government. Anti-clericals resented Church control of education as this meant the perpetuation of pro-monarchist and anti-republican teachings. Under the Third Republic a number of measures were introduced to reduce Church influence, e.g. permittance of civil marriage and divorce, expulsion of the Jesuit order, state-school education removed from clerical control, and most importantly the 1905 Law of Separation, which disestablished the Church following the impact of the Dreyfus Case. 4-5

- (b) Compare **Sources A** and **B** and use your own knowledge.

How fully does **Source A** support the view in **Source B** in explaining the influence of the Church during the years of Bourbon rule, 1814-1830? (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 sees Church influence as powerful whereas Source A comments on the loss of Church influence. Level 2 answers will demonstrate that both sources agree that the Bourbon restoration renewed Church influence; however Source A clearly states that the Church was not as powerful as it had once been. At Level 3, Source B regards the Church as a negative/undermining influence during Bourbon rule, as ‘Clericalism... was regarded by liberals with intense suspicion’ and that the Law on Sacrilege ‘touched some of the most sensitive of all political nerves for nineteenth century Frenchmen’. Source A comments that Church influence was positive as it helped to increase support for the Bourbons by acting as ‘a force for cohesion’. For Level 4, answers will be as Level 3, but a very clear understanding of the contrasts within the sources. Sources A and B illustrate the ‘alliance of throne and altar’, whereby the Church turned to the aristocracy and monarchy for protection and support. However, it can be argued that Source B regards the Church as increasingly influential in this alliance during the reign of Charles X, whereas the focus of Source A is on the mutual benefits following the restoration in 1815. Own knowledge could include detail on special Church privileges, the relationship between the Church and ultras etc.

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

“Relations between the Catholic Church and the State, rather than any other issue, posed the most serious threat to the political stability of France in the years 1814 to 1914.”

Assess the validity of this view.

(15 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. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***  
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. 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. **5-8**

- 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. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the 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. **12-13**
- 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. **14-15**

### Indicative content

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question. It is not necessary to have detailed knowledge of the whole period in the same depth but answers must cover the two themes (Catholic Church/religious issues and political instability) and show understanding of continuity and change through the 100 years. Candidates may argue that the Catholic Church was not a major cause of political instability during the years 1814-1914 and that other factors were e.g. the incompetence of individual leaders, socio-economic problems, foreign policy failures, political scandal, political arguments between Left and Right etc. However, for answers to be awarded Level 2 and above there must be an understanding demonstrated about the contribution of religious arguments to political instability over the 100 year period.

In 1814 the Church was clearly still suffering the losses of the Revolution of 1789 (Source A). Throughout the 100 year period the Church failed to regain its previous status, wealth and land, whilst supporters of anti-clericalism were unable to completely remove its influence from French life, despite their victory over the field of education and the law of Separation. The Church did experience periods of revival and it was during these periods that Church-State relations became politically sensitive and contributed to intervals of political instability (especially under the Bourbons and during the Third Republic). Arguments over Church influence can be seen in terms of the wider political debate between the Right and Left in France. Republicans wanted to defend the gains of the Revolution and saw any attempts by the Church to reassert its influence as an attack on liberty and democracy, whereas Monarchists supported a Church revival as a way of reinstating the *ancien regime* and destroying liberalism.

The first period of Church revival occurred under Bourbon rule, 1814-1830, when there was a mutually beneficial 'alliance of throne and altar'. Increased influence came through the law on Sacrilege, the personal backing of Charles X (Source B) and 'renewed control in education' (Source A). This renewal of clericalism inflamed the opposition to Charles X and was a factor in his downfall during the 1830 Revolution.

Under Louis-Phillippe religious issues lost their intensity through the breaking of the alliance. The Church faced mild persecution between 1830-1848. Church-state relations were not a

contributing factor to the political instability experienced by the July Monarchy, as initially it was due to various challenges to the legitimacy of the Orleanist monarchy, whilst the Revolution of 1848 was primarily a result of socio-economic discontent intensified by political incompetence.

Under the Second Republic, Church influence grew due to the passing of the Falloux Law (Source C). This law increased Republican opposition to clerical conservatism. The Church initially supported Napoleon III during his authoritarian decade because of his support for the Pope's temporal power and defence of social order. However, Catholics became increasingly alienated by the regime due to Napoleon's role in Italian unification. This foreign policy mistake along with others contributed to the collapse of the Second Empire.

It can be argued that religious issues contributed significantly to the political instability of the Third Republic, culminating in the separation of Church and State in 1905, which marked a victory for anti-clericalism (Source D). A bitter political row ensued over the Church's control of education, which resulted in Ferry's reforms of 1882. His attack on the influence of the Church reinforced the hostility of clerical conservatism towards the Republic. The period of reconciliation known, as the *Ralliement* in the early 1890s was short lived and the religious issue intensified with the Dreyfus case 1896. The Church sided with the Anti-Dreyfusards and launched a renewed attack on the Republic which was countered by the anti-clerical Prime Ministers Waldeck-Rousseau and Combes, whose legislation resulted in the 1905 Law of Separation.

However, candidates may argue that political instability during the Third Republic was also created by the growth of socialism and the various political scandals, e.g. Boulanger and the Panama Canal. Alternatively they may argue that political instability was an illusion because the administration of France continued unaffected and that the peasant majority of the population were conservative in nature and did not take an interest in the political arguments of Paris.

Level 1 answers will demonstrate limited range and make assertions about political instability in France. At Level 2 implicit links between Church-State relations and/or other factors to political instability will be made, these should be explicit at Level 3 with some reference to the sources. At Level 4 there will be an understanding of how Church-State relations caused political instability balanced against a range of other factors. At Level 5 judgement about the changing relationship between the Church and State over the 100 year period most probably linked to the concept of left and right wing in France will be developed.

## Section B

### Question 2 onward

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

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

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

**L1: *Either***

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

***Or***

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-6**

**L2: *Either***

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

***Or***

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

**L3:** Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

**L4:** Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

**L5:** As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

**Question 2**

To what extent was the success of the Risorgimento due to the weaknesses of the Austrian Empire in the years 1848 to 1871? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

**Indicative content**

The relative strength/weakness of Austria did play a key role in the success of the Risorgimento. The Italian Revolutions of 1848-49 were defeated by swift Austrian military recovery. The revolutionary regimes and Charles Albert were defeated by Austrian forces led by Radetsky, whilst the Austrian Navy crushed the Venetian Republic. Harsh autocratic government returned, supported by the Austrian troops in the Legations, Tuscany, Modena and Parma. Conversely, during the period 1858-1871, the weakness of Austria was a major factor in the success of Italian Unification. Habsburg ability to control its Italian provinces and sustain influence in the peninsula was challenged by major internal problems within the empire (economic, political and ethnic). War in the Crimea had revealed divisions within the Holy Alliance, whilst the war of 1859 drove the Austrians out of Lombardy and led to bloody defeats at Magenta and Solferino. In the 1860s, Austria was increasingly distracted by the German Question and was overshadowed by the rise of Prussia. Venetia was claimed in 1866 following the Italian support for Prussia in the Austro-Prussian war, whilst the acquisition of Rome in 1870 was also the result of Prussian intervention (this time against the French).

However, the role of Austria is only one factor in the failure of the Risorgimento in 1848-1849. Candidates may also discuss the role of French troops in defeating the Roman Republic, the lack of mass support for the revolutionary movement from the peasantry, lack of co-ordination and different aims amongst the revolutionaries. Again, in the period 1858-1871, the success of the Risorgimento was dependent upon factors other than Austrian weaknesses. Candidates may wish to discuss the diplomatic role played by Cavour and the decisive action taken by Garibaldi during the campaigns of 1860 in Sicily and Naples, which drew Piedmont into the affairs of the South of the peninsula. The external roles of France and Prussia may also be assessed.

Level 1 responses will probably give a brief and incomplete account of the progress of Italian unification but Level 2 answers should begin to look at the weaknesses of the Austrian Empire. At Level 3 accounts of the progress of the Risorgimento should be fuller. Level 4 accounts will probably explicitly recognise how Austria hindered the success of the Risorgimento in the period 1848-58 and helped in 1858-71 and balance this with a range of internal factors promoting unification, e.g. diplomacy of Cavour, actions of Garibaldi. Level 5 responses will cover the whole period and make judgements about the relative importance of Austria.

**Question 3**

“The architect of the Italian nation.”

“A Piedmontese expansionist.”

Which of these statements provides the more convincing explanation of Cavour’s role in political and diplomatic developments in Italy in the years 1848-1861?

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

Marks as follows:

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

**Indicative content**

Candidates must focus however briefly on both statements to achieve Level 3 and above. An analysis of Cavour’s aims reveals the extent to which he desired to extend Piedmont’s control in the north of the Peninsula. In 1848 he speculated about a new Kingdom of Northern Italy and rejected the idea of a single federated state, which he associated with Mazzini’s revolutionary republicanism. Far from being a nationalist Cavour was ignorant about the south. He aimed to expel Austria and absolutism by creating a strong modern state, which he did through a series of constitutional and economic reforms in the 1850s. Arguably Piedmont’s intervention in the Crimean War was not to gain the support of Britain and France for Italian Unification, but to avoid his own dismissal by Victor Emmanuel. The Treaty of Plombières reveals Cavour’s lack of enthusiasm for a united peninsula as it concerned only the annexation of Lombardy, Venetia, Parma and Modena; Cavour’s ultimate aim was the “aggrandisement of Piedmont”.

There is no denying the fact that when the new Kingdom of Italy was proclaimed in March 1861, Cavour as the Prime Minister of Piedmont had overseen each stage of the unification process. However it can be argued that Cavour was reacting to a series of events which forced him to adapt his initial plans for Piedmontese expansion, e.g. the betrayal by Napoleon III at Villafranca, the fear of social and political anarchy following the collapse of Austrian rule in central Italy. Thus when Cavour was reinstated as Prime Minister it was of a greatly enlarged Kingdom of Northern Italy. It was the subsequent actions of Garibaldi and the ‘Thousand’ in Sicily and Naples (1860) and their threat to the Papal States which forced Cavour to undertake his risky invasion of the Papal States, thus uniting northern and southern Italy. Without this invasion Garibaldi may have been able to establish a rival to Piedmontese power in the south, or gain the credit for Italian Unification. The extent of Cavour’s plans for Piedmont can clearly be seen in the last months before his death when he began the process of Piedmontisation whereby the laws of Piedmont were to be enforced throughout Italy.

Level 1 responses will either give incomplete, patchy narrative about Cavour, or make assertions about his role. At Level 2 answers will agree with one of the statements (probably “architect of the Italian nation”) and make links between the role of Cavour and Italian unification. At Level 3 there will be reference to both statements in an attempt to balance and perhaps an attempt to identify Cavour’s aims. At Level 4 responses will explicitly link Cavour’s aims and develop a balanced argument supporting and refuting the statements. Level 5 responses will make clear judgements about the role of Cavour.



**Question 4**

“The weaknesses of the newly unified Italian State were the result of the alienation of the Catholic Church rather than economic and regional divisions.”  
How valid is this assessment of the problems facing Italy 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 attitude of the Catholic Church did create political and social problems for the new Italian State. However economic differences between the industrial North and agricultural South and the regional resentment of Piedmontisation contributed significantly to the weakness of Italy. There must be some focus on religious issues, economic and regional divisions (however brief) for answers awarded Level 3 or above.

In September 1870 Italian troops occupied Rome and transferred the government of the unified state to the capital marking an intensification in the animosity that the Church felt towards the State. Alienation of the Catholic Church began in earnest in 1861 when Turin’s anti-clerical laws were extended throughout the whole of Italy. The Syllabus of Errors (1864) was in essence a manifesto of Church opposition to the liberal ways of the new state. Priests throughout Italy preached the Pope’s opposition and reminded good Catholics that they were forbidden from holding public office and from voting in elections (restricting the limited franchise further). Papal Infallibility was declared (July 1870) and non-recognition of the State continued despite the Law of Guarantees (1871). Thus in a country as loyally Catholic as Italy the newly unified state faced constant and influential opposition.

Economic divisions were also an important contributing factor to Italy’s weaknesses. Unification left a huge debt. Indirect taxes caused peasant revolts, the most serious occurring in January 1869. The introduction of free trade throughout Italy lowered the price of the South’s agricultural products and restricted investment in industry. The economy became increasingly dualist.

Regional divisions prevented widespread acceptance of unification due to the lack of a common language. Southern States in particular felt that they were being treated as conquered territories and resented Piedmont’s attempts to centralise the state. The ‘Brigands War’ lasted for many years and required a northern army of occupation to keep the peace.

Level 1 answers may simply describe the state of the newly unified Italy or assert reasons for weaknesses. Level 2 responses will give a more detailed description of the state of Italy, but will probably lack focus on religious issues. At Level 3 breadth and depth of explanations should demonstrate synoptic understanding. Level 4 answers will clearly be analytical whilst Level 5 responses will prioritise and make sound judgements about the religious, economic and regional reasons for the weaknesses of the Italian state.

**Question 5**

“Nicholas I’s principles of ‘Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality’ had done more to weaken than strengthen Tsarism in Russia by 1855.”

How valid is this assessment of Nicholas I’s political legacy? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

**Indicative content**

The focus of answers is an assessment of Nicholas’ legacy, not an analysis of his policies. Better answers will probably try to define his principles of ‘Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality’ and comment on how they contributed to the stagnation of Russian political, social and economic affairs by 1855. ‘Orthodoxy’ prevented any meaningful political reform because in essence it meant that the Tsar’s rule was based upon divine right, whilst the Church maintained a stranglehold on society and perpetuated social inequality, immortalised by serfdom. ‘Autocracy’ ensured that the Tsar was seen as powerful, protective father figure, safeguarding his subjects from dangerous political concepts such as liberalism and socialism, which alienated the more educated and enlightened Russians. ‘Nationality’ was the promotion of Russian culture at the expense of the national minorities (particularly the Poles following the crushing of the Polish revolt), thus contributing to ethnic tension and opposition within the empire. Therefore, Nicholas’ principles contributed to a number of serious problems at the end of his reign. The serf question needed to be addressed because it prevented the modernisation of Russian society and economy. It also provoked intense liberal and radical opposition (e.g. Westernisers, Petrashevsky Circle, and intellectual revolt from Herzen and Bakunin). However any emancipation was considered dangerous to the foundations of Tsarist rule and so any criticism was curtailed by the tightening of censorship and the increase in surveillance by the Third Section (all of which would lead to increases in terrorism in successive reigns). The long term problems of ruling the Russian empire (huge land mass, diverse nationalities, poor communications, over-population, under developed economy etc) were intensified by Nicholas’ principles which created an inefficient bureaucracy incapable of reform.

Level 1 responses will offer incomplete accounts of Nicholas I reign, whilst at Level 2 descriptions will offer more depth and range. Level 3 answers will explicitly focus on the ruling principles (but will probably lack balance) and begin to assess the impact of Nicholas’ legacy. At Level 4 there will be a balanced analysis of the impact of Nicholas I’s rule with reference to strengths and weaknesses. Level 5 responses will clearly make judgements about the condition of Russia in 1855.

**Question 6**

To what extent was the economy and society of Tsarist Russia transformed in the years 1861 to 1881? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

**Indicative content**

Answers should focus on the condition of Russia's economy and society in 1861 and assess the degree to which they had changed (for the better or worse) by 1881, giving reasons for change, or lack of change. Better answers will try to define what is meant by the key word transformed – it assumes a complete change, in Russia's case the movement away from a stagnant pre-industrial society and economy dominated by agriculture and serfs to an economy that was growing due to industrialisation, however there had been little change in the make-up of society. In 1861 the extent of Russian economic backwardness had been clearly highlighted by defeat in the Crimean war. Russia was lagging further behind her competitors in Western Europe.

Candidates should detail some of the measures introduced by Alexander II that attempted to modernise and revitalise the Russian economy and society, e.g. the Emancipation of the Serfs, the introduction of the zemstvos, legal, educational and army reforms. Descriptive accounts about these reforms are not useful unless they are clearly linked to their impact on society and the economy. The Emancipation of the Serfs (1861) was the first attempt to transform the structure of society through the economy. In theory Emancipation should have promoted more social mobility and industrialisation. However the peasants' situation steadily worsened and most nobles resented the changes. The inadequacy of peasant landholdings prevented the rapid rise of a new consumer class and the majority of landowners remained in debt. Emancipation was a failure due to crushing debt payments, poor quality plots of land and the introduction of the *Mir*. Production in mining, wool, sugar and paper declined and matters were worsened by a serious depression in the early 1870s.

However, Russia did undergo a period of industrialisation under Alexander II, which was then continued by Alexander III. By the 1870s the Russian economy was to some extent transformed by the increase in railway building and the policy of low tariffs which helped the import of raw materials. The development of financial institutions helped to stimulate the economy. Heavy industry and consumer goods production began to expand at an average rate of 5% per year. Despite the economic progress made between 1861-1881 Russia's economy was far from transformed, but the process of modernisation had begun.

Level 1 responses will give incomplete narrative/assertion accounts about Alexander II reforms, whilst at Level 2 descriptive accounts about reforms will have more depth, but will possibly be assertive about "transformed". At Level 3 some links will be made (not always explicitly) between reforms and changes in the economy and society. Level 4 and Level 5 responses will have a clear analytical approach to measuring the extent of transformation in the economy and society.

**Question 7**

How effective were the various elements of political and nationalist opposition to Tsarism in the years 1861 to 1881? *(20 marks)*

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

Marks as follows:

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

**Indicative content**

The key to a successful answer is a clear definition of the aims of various opposition groups and an analysis of the degree of success that they had in achieving those aims. The relative strength of the Tsarist regime and its success at countering opposition can also be considered. The Poles presented the most serious nationalist opposition. Nationalist demonstrations began in 1861 and developed into the revolt of 1863. Initially concessions were granted, e.g. emancipation of Polish Jews, the opening of a university in Warsaw and agrarian reform. However rigid Russification was imposed following the revolt in an attempt to quash nationalism, the property of the Polish Catholic Church was confiscated (1864), the university was closed (1869) and Russian was imposed as the administrative language.

Political opposition to Tsarism varied, from the moderate to the radical. The works of intellectuals like Herzen and Lavrow promoted the formation of the Populists (*Narodniks*). They began a 'To the People' crusade in 1873. Populism failed to win mass support and 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.

Political and nationalist opposition was increasingly rendered ineffective by the harsh repressive measures that the Tsarist regime enforced. In 1862 prominent radicals were arrested for sedition, political opponents were imprisoned and exiled to Siberia. Censorship was increased and leading radical journals were closed down, zemstovs were forbidden to communicate with each other and police supervision of the universities was increased.

Level 1 and Level 2 answers will rely on assertion or description with only an implicit understanding. Level 3 will have a sound overview of opposition, whilst Level 4 and Level 5 responses will clearly assess effectiveness of a range of opposition groups and evaluate the strength of Tsarist response.

**Question 8**

To what extent were the political and economic aims of the Prussian liberals achieved in the years 1848 to 1862? (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**

A clear definition of liberal aims is required. There must be some focus on economic and political aims, but a completely balanced approach is not necessary. Politically the liberals believed in the removal of absolutism, constitutional government, basic political rights (freedom of speech etc.) and a national solution to the German problem. Economically they aimed for free markets and a policy of *laissez-faire*. Therefore the liberals were more successful at achieving their economic rather than political aims. The Zollverein and the development of industry contrast sharply with the failures of 1848, Olmutz and the hijacking of unification by Bismarck and conservatism from 1862 onwards.

Prussia fulfilled the liberals' economic aims. The success of the Prussian Customs Union resulted in the launch of the Zollverein in 1834. All internal customs barriers were dismantled and Prussia's economic ascendancy over Austria began in earnest.

Before 1862 the liberals did have some hope of political success through Prussia. The 1848 Revolutions may have failed but the fact that Frederick William IV proclaimed a new, if highly conservative, constitution was politically significant, as absolutism had not been fully restored. In 1858 a 'New Era' of liberalism seemed to have opened in Prussia. The Liberals won a majority of more than 150 seats in the *Landtag* elections and the new Regent, Wilhelm I, had little time for the conservative old order. By 1862 hopes for the 'New Era' had been dashed due to the protracted arguments over the Army Bill.

Answers at Level 1 and Level 2 will be descriptive and assertive and freely interchange the aims of the Prussian liberals for the progress of German unification. At Level 3 there will be an attempt to focus explicitly on the aims of the Prussian liberals, but there will be a lack of balance on both issues. Level 4 and Level 5 responses will have clear assessment about achievement of aims and judgement.

**Question 9**

How far was the defeat of Austria in 1866 the result of Prussian economic and military strengths rather than Austrian weaknesses? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

**Indicative content**

The focus of this essay is the resolution of the ‘German Problem’ and the victory at Sadowa for the advocates of a *Kleindeutsch* (without Austria) as opposed to a *Grossdeutsch* (with Austria) solution. The 1848 revolutions ended the tradition of dualism between Austria and the German states. Initially Austria was able to maintain some degree of authority over Prussia, yet this decreased throughout the period. The Erfurt Union was viewed by Austria with intense suspicion and terminated at Olmutz in 1851. This profoundly humiliated Prussia and marked the brief return of Austrian ascendancy. Throughout the 1850s Prussia wanted to reassert her dignity and power and increasingly it seemed as though war would be the only way to exclude Austria from the German States. The Zollverein increased Prussia’s economic power by stimulating trade, heavy industry, manufacturing, investment and railways. This industrial revolution explained the expansion of Prussian military capacity and its strengthened diplomatic position as leader of the German Nationalist movement. Therefore the success of the *Zollverein* and the period of rapid industrialisation ensured that Prussia would have the economic and military capability to defeat Austria if conflict did occur.

In contrast to Prussia’s growing economic and military strength Austria was a power in decline following the 1848 Revolutions. The Austrian economy was largely agricultural with pockets of industry confined largely to the western regions. Austrian weaknesses included: the increasing problem of minority nationalism (especially in the Italian States) and economic downturn following the depression in the 1850s. Economic problems were exacerbated by military intervention in the Italian States in 1848 and 1859 and by the Crimean War.

Bismarck’s direction of Prussian policy after 1862 ensured that Austria was diplomatically isolated following the Schleswig-Holstein crisis before the war with Prussia in 1866.

Level 1 and Level 2 responses will give a range of descriptive accounts about German unification. Level 3 responses will have some reference to Austrian weaknesses and Prussian strengths. At Level 4 and Level 5 responses will prioritise and make connections between the various factors to reach a judgement about the defeat of Austria in 1866.

**Question 10**

“A ruthless opportunist able to manipulate any diplomatic incident.”

“The master-planner with every move worked out in advance.”

Which of these statements provides the more convincing assessment of Bismarck’s political and diplomatic role during the unification of Germany in the years 1862 to 1871?  
(20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

**Indicative content**

Candidates must address both of the statements, however a completely balanced approach is not necessary. The view that Bismarck was a “master-planner” is now largely discredited and attributed to Bismarck himself following his famous conversation with Disraeli in 1862. Within his master plan he is seen to create a war with Denmark in 1864 in order to provide the pretext for war with Austria; he then engineered a favourite diplomatic situation in order to complete his blue-print for unification by bringing about a war in which he could humiliate France. This is now widely regarded as a pattern imposed upon events after they took place, rather than the result of Bismarck’s master planning. Candidates will therefore probably devote much of their essay on the first statement. Bismarck was a talented politician and expert opportunist. He took advantage of situations as they arose and was not afraid of experimentation. Instead of following a pre-determined policy of action he pursued a ‘strategy of alternatives’ thus giving the impression that he diverted and even directed the course of events during unification. Bismarck was also lucky; Danish foreign policy in 1863-64 was inept, Austrian foreign policy between 1864-66 was naïve and confused, whilst French foreign policy was disastrous (especially in 1870). Candidates should provide examples of Bismarck’s diplomacy between 1862-1871. Evidence could include the Schleswig-Holstein crisis, the Danish War, negotiations with Italy and France as context for the military defeat of Austria, the impact of the Luxembourg crisis as a preface to the Hohenzollern Candidature, the Franco-Prussian War and the completion of unity in 1871.

Level 1 and Level 2 answers are likely to adopt one uncritical view of Bismarck and assert it without much evidence or discrimination. Level 3 responses may have sound assessments but be lacking in either depth of evidence or balanced coverage. Answers at Level 4 and above will resolve the debate by means of a well-argued case, backed by specific evidence.

**June 2004**

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

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

**Question 1**

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

Assess the validity of the interpretation in the source about the importance of the storming of the Bastille, 14 July 1789. (10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

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

**Indicative content**

At Level 1 candidates will identify Roberts's view in the source that the storming of the Bastille was a very important event because it was a "strong candidate for the title of the day on which the French Revolution began" and it was "a great psychological and symbolic turning-point." At Level 2 and Level 3 the use of the extract will be more extensive and analytical rather than literal. The storming of the Bastille was an important event for Roberts because it was a "symbolic turning-point" which marked the end of the absolute monarchy in France and the beginning of the constitutional monarchy, which shared power with the National Assembly. The only way to restore Louis XVI's absolutism would be if war was declared on the Revolutionaries by other monarchical regimes in Europe. Own knowledge about the importance of the storming of the Bastille includes; the Bastille was stormed for ammunition, not the release of prisoners, and from this came the destruction of a symbol of the arbitrary power of the absolute monarchy. 14 July was the first and most famous *journées* and was important because those who had taken part in the attack on the Bastille were not wealthy middle-class but *sans-culottes*. The King lost control of Paris, he agreed to recall Necker and three days later he wore the Revolutionary cockade in his hat. In Paris the Commune was established. Lafayette was appointed commander of the National Guard, the National Assembly began to draw up a constitution and Louis could no longer dictate to the Assembly because he could no longer rely on the armed forces. Outside of Paris the peasant revolution intensified and the authority of the King collapsed in most French towns. 20,000 nobles emigrated including the King's brother the Comte d'Artois. Level 3 and Level 4 answers will probably focus on and assess Robert's claim that 14 July was a "great psychological and symbolic turning-point". Answers which produce evidence to refute



Roberts's claim that 14 July was "the day on which the French Revolution began" are clearly Level 3 and above. Rees and Townson agree with J M Roberts's view, whilst D G Wright disagrees. He argues that it is possible to view the impact of the storming of the Bastille as a climax of a national revolution, which had its roots in the revolt of the aristocracy which began in 1787 and which intensified in January 1789.

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

How useful is this source as an explanation of the motives for the actions of the crowd during the revolutionary *journées* of 1789? (10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

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

### **Indicative content**

Level 1 will make superficial statements about the content of the source, e.g. the price of bread, taxation, and political emotions as motives for crowd action. Level 2 responses will use the extract more extensively. For example, Williams admits in the source that it is "difficult to unravel motives", therefore the reasons why the Parisian crowd took action during the revolutionary *journées* of 1789 are complex and often intertwined. At Level 3 and Level 4 candidates will focus on Williams's difficulty to find clear motives for the *journées* and argue that this is a limitation of the source. The ambiguity of Williams's term "traditional" can be questioned as can the failure to explain "overtly political emotions", in addition he does not explain which social groups took part in the uprisings and refers to them only as "people with families to feed". At Level 4 judgement will be extended and the source's weaknesses analysed closely. Own knowledge about the motives of the Parisian crowd during 1789 should be used to develop those that Williams identifies in the source (price of bread, taxation, and political emotions). Economic motives include: widespread hunger which led to violence as the catastrophic harvest of 1788 sent the price of bread soaring (it was at its highest point on 14 July 1789) and decreased the purchasing power of wage earners. Migrants who flooded into Paris looking for work placed increased pressure upon already scarce food supplies. Food shortages in Paris also motivated the women who stormed the *Hôtel de Ville* and then marched into Versailles during the "October Days". Customs posts, which increased the price of foodstuff and firewood in Paris, were attacked. Political motives include: reactions to the political events of May-June 1789, the call for the

reinstatement of Necker, and Louis's reaction to the August Decrees and the Rights of Man. In addition candidates could argue that fear was a major motivating factor for the *journées* of 1789 – fear of an aristocratic plot to overthrow the Assembly and reassert the King's power, intensified by the presence of 30,000 troops in the Paris area in July 1789.

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

“The crowd was the driving force of the Revolution.”

How valid is this judgement on the impact of crowd action on the course of the French Revolution in the years 1789 to 1792? (20 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

### Indicative content

The actions of the crowd/*sans-culottes* were an important factor in driving the Revolution forward. Candidates may argue that the actions of the crowd at key moments (e.g. 14 July 1789, 5 October 1789, 17 July 1791, 10 August 1792) were central to the failure of the moderate revolution of 1789 and the overturning of the bourgeois revolution by 1792. Source A illustrates how the crowd forced the Bastille to surrender and that this event was “a great psychological and symbolic turning-point”. Source C by Williams argues that the

*jours* initiated by the crowd “were the very motor of the Revolution” and that “the multiple revolutions of 1789 would have been impossible” without the actions of the crowd which reflects his acceptance that the *sans-culottes* were a key feature of the Revolution. Source B challenges the judgement to some extent by arguing that the Revolution was underway before the militant action of the crowd on 14 July 1789. Candidates can illustrate this further with evidence of the spontaneity and lack of organisation exhibited by the crowd or they can draw on their knowledge of Rudé. Rudé argues that the crowd were not just incoherent and bloodthirsty mobs driven by little more than the attractions of violence. Source B also states that the “crowd became much more organised” after the storming of the Bastille and better candidates may choose to use this turning point within their argument. Source D disagrees with the judgement and reflects the view of Rees and Townson that crowd influence was much more significant after the war was declared. Although they recognise that the crowd were important during the events of 1789 they argue that the crowd was easily suppressed by the leaders of the bourgeois Revolution as illustrated by events at Champ de Mars, July 1791. Therefore candidates may disagree with the judgement and focus on the attack on the Tuileries in August 1792 as the key date for growth of *sans-culottes* power. Other driving forces of the Revolution include the impact of war and civil war, the opposition of the King to the Assembly and his treachery and the activities of the émigrés and foreign powers. Marxists focus on “class” and the fluctuations in the economy and Rudé reflects this view. Traditionalists concentrate on individuals and/or groups such as the Girondist and Jacobin leaders. Whilst others emphasise the power of ideas and Palmer is famous for his ‘Atlantic Revolution’ thesis, which deals in the importance of ideologies and radical ideas.