



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative D Unit 4

Mark Scheme

2008 examination – June series

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

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

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

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

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

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

Level 1:***Either***

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

Or

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

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

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

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

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

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

Level 2:***Either***

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

Or

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

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

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

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

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

Level 3:

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

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

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

Level 4:

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

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

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

Level 5:

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

Exemplification/guidance

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

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

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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

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

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

So, is the response:

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

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

June 2008

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

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

Section A: Political Instability in France, 1814–1914

Question 1

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

How fully do these two sources explain the different views of the failure of the French Monarchy in the years 1814 to 1848? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Indicative content

At Level 1 there will be uncontrolled use of the sources and limited recognition of the contrasting views, e.g. Source A states that Charles X was obstinate, Source B that most people had lost confidence in the regime as it was not based on tradition. At Level 2, candidates will demonstrate that both sources realise that it is in part due to the personalities of the Monarchy. However, Sources A and B identify other reasons, e.g. Source A refers to the links between the Bourbon Monarchy and the Church whilst Source B refers to the lack of a wide support base for the Orleanist Monarchy. Both sources find other reasons for the failure of both Monarchies besides the inadequacies of the kings but some knowledge of the inadequacies of Charles X and Louis-Philippe should at least be implied. Level 3 answers will make explicit comments about the inadequacies of the Monarchs from the sources and own knowledge and compare them to other reasons for the failure of the Monarchies from the source and own knowledge, e.g. references to Charles X's reliance on Polignac, the Ordinances of St Cloud, Louis-Philippe's foreign policy, lack of reform, introduction of censorship in 1832, huge civil list. Level 4 answers should be able to make judgements as to how far the sources explain the views in the sources and how far other factors were to blame. Source A is strong on blaming the personality of the monarch as well as other factors whereas Source B hints that the constitutional Orleanist monarch experiment was flawed from the start.

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

‘The failure to achieve political stability in France in the years 1814 to 1914 was due, above all, to the influence of the Catholic Church.’

Assess the validity of this statement.

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

L2: ***Either***

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

Or

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

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

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

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

Indicative content

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

It is not necessary to have detailed knowledge of the whole period in the same depth but answers must cover the two themes (political stability and relations between the Catholic Church and the State) and show understanding of continuity and change through the 100 years. Many will agree that relations between the Catholic Church and State led to political instability, anticlericalism, republicanism and the collapse of regimes such as in 1830 and 1848. However, 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, for example, 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 years period.

In 1814 the Church was clearly still suffering the losses of the Revolution of 1789. 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 the 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 and renewed control in education. The renewal of clericalism inflamed the opposition to Charles X and was a factor in his downfall during the 1830 Revolution (Source A). Under Louis-Philippe 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 and a lack of tradition or legitimacy in the regime (Source B).

Under the Second Republic, Church influence grew due to the passing of the *Falloux* Law and foreign policy (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 periods 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 was 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 France will be developed.

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

Candidates answer **one** question from the following (2–10). These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

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

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: *Either*

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

Or

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

L2: *Either*

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

Or

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

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

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

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

Option A: Italian Unification, 1848–1871
Question 2

'It was the decline of Austria rather than the strength of Piedmont, which led to the success of the Risorgimento in the years 1848–1870.'

To what extent do you agree with this view?

(20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Austria's relative strength/weakness did play a key role in the success of the Risorgimento but it is only one factor among several including the role of Piedmont. For the period 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 1859–1871, the success of the Risorgimento was dependent upon factors other than Austrian weaknesses. For example, candidates may discuss the increasing strength of Piedmont as it expanded in the north of Italy during 1859 and 1860. Candidates may also 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 peninsular. The external roles of France and Prussia may also be assessed.

As regards Austria, the Italian Revolutions of 1848–1849 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 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 peninsular 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-Prussia War, whilst the acquisition of Rome in 1870 was also the result of Prussian intervention (this time against the French).

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 weakness 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 1848–1858 and helped in 1858–1871 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

‘Garibaldi’s skill as a soldier was more important than his role in politics in Italy in the years 1848 to 1870.’

How valid is this view?

(20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Garibaldi returned to Italy in 1848. His offer to help Charles Albert was spurned and he took little part in the revolutions. His support for Charles Albert is odd given his Mazzinian republicanism and it is evidence of a lack of political acumen. Politics and diplomatic niceties meant little to Garibaldi; unification by any means was his aim. His defence of Rome in 1849 was legendary and inspired others. He also fought in 1859 but his outrage at the cession of Nice to France at Villafranca again showed a lack of diplomatic awareness. In 1860 he took the Thousand to the Sicilian revolution and defeated the Neapolitan army. His expedition was opposed by Cavour and was contrary to political, diplomatic and military sense. Cavour feared that Garibaldi’s actions had divided Italians, would provoke international intervention (especially from France) and an uncontrollable civil war involving Piedmont, the Papal States and Naples. Garibaldi did not understand the political and diplomatic implications of his actions yet they succeeded in annexing southern Italy to the already united north. He had rekindled the Risorgimento as only a soldier could. His rule in Sicily failed the peasants. It did not matter to Garibaldi as long as the Neapolitan army was expelled. He invaded Naples despite Cavour’s attempts to stop him and there was a danger of a serious split in the forces of the Risorgimento. Many Mazzinian (republican) Garibaldini opposed Victor Emmanuel but Garibaldi was blind to such politics. He took Naples and planned to take Rome and the Papal States and offer them to the King of Piedmont. Diplomatic intervention (especially from France) was possible and Cavour’s dash south with Victor Emmanuel, defeating the Pope at Castel Fidardo, was to stop Garibaldi before he did any more damage – or before he stole Cavour’s glory as the unifier of Italy. The King met Garibaldi at Teano to cement Italian unity but Victor Emmanuel suspected Garibaldi. He weakened the King’s control of Italian affairs. The conquest of the south was remarkable but inappropriate given mutual north-south suspicion. Garibaldi was unaware of designs to marginalise the Garibaldini. His desertion of the Sicilian peasants and capitulation to Cavour showed no understanding of the problems of unification and Piedmontisation the south would endure. Garibaldi’s attempts to claim Rome (1862, 1867) defied diplomatic logic, were defeated by the French and Piedmontese and embarrassed Victor Emmanuel. Diplomacy by the new Italian state was more successful, e.g. the Prussian Alliance brought Venetia in 1866. Rome was taken by Italian troops in 1870 but Garibaldi was elsewhere fighting for the French against the Prussians. He failed to see that Italian unity could be completed during the Franco-Prussian war. Politics and diplomacy were not his forte. He was a guerrilla fighter and an unpredictable leader who inspired others with his dreams of unity. Whether Garibaldi’s skill as a soldier was his only contribution to Italian Unification is what needs to be discussed.

Level 1 answers will offer short descriptions of Garibaldi’s activities or ill informed biography. Level 2 answers will have more relevant material with perhaps an uncritical view of Garibaldi’s contribution to the Risorgimento. Level 3 answers will have good coverage, if with some imbalance of the questions theme along with evaluation of Garibaldi’s role as a leader of Italian

Unification. Level 4 answers will have independent judgement, based on extensive material, with some discrimination about the variable importance of Garibaldi's different roles in the process of unification. Level 5 answers will be as Level 4 but with extensively sustained judgement as appropriate to the question.

Question 4

'The hostility of the Catholic Church rather than economic factors, was the major weakness of the newly unified Italian State.'

How valid is this view 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

In September 1870 Italian troops had occupied Rome and transferred government of the unified state to the capital. This made for an intensification in the animosity that the Church felt towards the state alienation of the Catholic Church that had begun 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 duellist. Regional differences can be used to illustrate economic division.

Regional differences prevented wide spread acceptance of unification due to the lack of a common language. Southern states in particular felt they were being treated as conquered territories and resented Piedmont's attempts to centralise the state. The 'Brigand's War' lasted for many years and required a northern army of occupation to keep the peace.

Economic differences between the industrial north and agricultural south and the attitude of the Catholic Church created political and social problems for the new Italian State. Even so, regional resentment of Piedmontism contributed significantly to the weakness of Italy. There must be some focus on the economic issues and religious views (however brief) for answers awarded Level 3 or above.

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. 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 regional and religious reasons for the weaknesses of the Italian State.

Option B: Russia, 1848–1881

Question 5

‘Nicholas I’s principle of “Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality” had strengthened rather than weakened Tsarism in Russia by 1855.’

Assess the validity of this view.

(20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

The focus of answers should be an assessment of Nicholas’s legacy, not an analysis of his policies. Many will argue that these policies weakened Tsarism rather than strengthening it as Nicholas intended. Better answers will probably try to define his principals of ‘Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality’ and comment on how they contributed to the stagnation of the Russian political, social and economic affairs by 1855. ‘Orthodoxy’ prevented any meaningful political reforms 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 a 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 revolts), thus contributing to ethnic tension and opposition from within the Empire. Therefore, Nicholas’s 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 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, underdeveloped economy etc.) were intensified by Nicholas’s principles, which created an inefficient bureaucracy incapable of reform.

Level 1 responses will offer incomplete accounts of Nicholas’s 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’s legacy. At Level 4 there will be a balanced analysis of the impact of Nicholas’s rule with reference to strengths and weaknesses. Level 5 responses will clearly make judgements about the condition of Russia in 1855.

Question 6

How effective was Alexander II's decision to emancipate the serfs in solving the major social and economic problems in Russia 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 emancipation of the serfs (1861) dealt with the most pressing social and economic problem. Serfdom was reformed because a stagnating economy, the impoverishment of both serfs and nobility and increased rural protest and terrorism threatened Tsarism's viability. Agriculture failed a population outstripping food supplies. Yet reform failed. Serfs faced generations of redemption payments and the conservative Mir imposed an administration making land reform impossible. Reform was required after Crimea but met noble opposition and angry serfs had poorer land and unprecedented, inflated prices to pay. Serfs were denied equality with other Russians and were subject to draconian legal measures. The edict created landless peasants incapable of being used in industry: unemployment and urban problems grew as they drifted to the towns. The nobility was weakened. Debt took the form of redemption payments and estates failed in the new competitive world. Serfdom was the linchpin of the Tsarist state and the nobility its most important foundation.

Other policies were passed to try to solve the social and economic problems at this time. Zemstovs (1864) and duma (1870) handled local government (e.g. health, education) and gave liberal groups some political responsibility. Yet they were controlled by the nobility and sensitive areas (policing) were excluded but there was real advance in local representation. Education reform (from 1861) expanded primary provision and diluted Orthodox influence. Control of Universities was relaxed yet from the late 1860s Tolstoy restricted entry and narrowed university and secondary school curriculum if education were more liberal than previously. Censorship (1865) eased with greater freedom of expression and fewer restrictions on foreign books. Repression returned, however. Economic reforms were significant. Railway building was increased, state finances restructured and fiscal policy and banking systems established. Yet compared to Western Europe progress was limited. Legal reforms (1864) introduced trial by jury, trial in public, appeals, the election of JPs and attacked corruption. Even if effectiveness is questioned (terrorists and peasants were denied legal rights) this was important progress. Military reforms (Miliutin) responded to Crimean inadequacies and may be used as social reforms. Periods of service endured by (Serfs) recruits were reduced, barbaric conditions reformed and aristocratic patronage removed. If it took decades for improvement reform had been tried and was not a complete failure.

Reforms were unable to remove all weaknesses: problems remained. The reform of autocracy was to weaken its foundations (serfdom, nobility, legal system). Compared to Europe, reform was piecemeal and Russia remained backward. Yet in contrast to earlier reigns this was a major attempt to modernise society, the economy and even government. This was an achievement but Alexander II could not remove Russia's weakness.

Level 1 answers will have fragmentary comment. Level 2 answers will have better coverage if lacking evaluation. Level 3 answers will have a good range of policy with some attempt to evaluate reform. Level 4 answers will have comprehensive policy material with developed appraisal of Alexander's reforms. Level 5 answers will be as Level 4 answers but with independent judgement which could include the context of the reforms and implications for their success and failure.

Question 7

'The crisis facing Alexander II in the last years of his reign was caused more by the failure of reform than by the strength of opposition to the Tsarist regime.'
Assess the validity of this view. (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

The key to a successful answer is an analysis of reforms compared to clear definitions of the aims of various opposition groups and an analysis of the degree of success that they had in achieving these 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 the 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 Lavrov promoted the formation of the populists (Warodniks). 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.

The reforms of Alexander II's reign initiated Russia's gradual transformation into a modern state. However, the reforms caused problems for Alexander. They were criticised as being incomplete and they unleashed the dissident forces mentioned above. This helped to bring about the crisis facing Alexander II at the end of his reign and resulted in his assassination in 1881. Candidates may discuss the emancipation of the serfs but this question is wider and answers need to discuss legal, military and local government reforms also.

Level 1 answers and Level 2 answers will rely on assertion or description with only an implicit understanding. Level 3 will have a sound overview of opposition and reforms, whilst Level 4 and Level 5 responses will clearly assess effectiveness of a range of opposition groups and the failure of reforms. They will make a balanced judgement over their role in bringing about the crisis in the Tsarist regime.

Option C: The Unification of Germany, 1848–1871

Question 8

‘It was class divisions within German nationalism, rather than a lack of effective leadership, that caused the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament in 1849.’

To what extent do you agree with this view? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The indecisive and prevaricating leadership of Von Gagern should be discussed. Other factors were the lack of an effective administration and military back up for the Frankfurt Parliament, and the challenge of non-German nationalism. However, the actions of Fredrich Wilhelm, King of Prussia were very important. His action of refusing to accept the crown of Germany offered by the Frankfurt Parliament (March 1849) sealed the failure of the 1848–1849 revolutions in the German States. The Frankfurt Parliament had failed to find a national figure to become the leader of their vision of a united Germany. However, Fredrich Wilhelm’s actions before this had important consequences on the course of the revolutionaries and therefore the success of the parliament. In March 1848 he made concessions to the revolutionaries and thereby kept his throne and bought time for the forces of conservatism to regroup. By withdrawing the army from Berlin he was able to maintain his loyalty and keep it together as a counter-revolutionary force. Supported by the Junkers and the army Fredrich Wilhelm was then able to dismiss the Prussian Parliament through a coup d’état (December 1848) and dictate a constitution. Fredrich Wilhelm refused the crown of Germany, withdrew delegates from the Frankfurt

Parliament and ordered Prussian troops to disperse the remainder of the Parliament now based at Stuttgart, thus drawing the revolutions to an end by June 1849.

Level 1 responses will probably give an incomplete narrative of the Frankfurt Parliament and/or the Revolutions in the German states. At Level 2 there will be some brief focus on the issues, but little understanding of the social and political weakness in German nationalism. Level 3 answers will be more explicit in the focus of why the Frankfurt Parliament failed. At Level 4, responses will be balanced with perhaps a discussion that includes other factors beyond class division and poor leadership to explain the failure of the Parliament, Level 5 answers will have judgement, clearly identifying and/or explaining reasons for the failure of the Revolutions.

Question 9

'In the years 1848 to 1871 it was "coal and iron" rather than "blood and iron" that secured German unification.'

To what extent do you agree with this view?

(20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Traditional explanation of German unification focuses on 'blood and iron' and claim it is the result of Bismarck's diplomacy. Master plan approaches are now repudiated but some candidates will argue for them. In this case candidates should mention the defeats of Denmark, Austria and France. Detail can include Austro-Prussian tension during the Schleswig-Holstein crisis and after Gastein (1865) and the Biarritz meeting with Napoleon III and the Italian alliance as preconditions for the war with Austria of 1866. Konnigratz and the Treaty of Prague (1866) produced the North German Confederation and the Zoll parliament designed to pull the southern German states into the Prussian orbit. Southern opposition to Prussia eased because of its fear of French design on Germany south of the Main. Relations with France deteriorated after 1866 (Luxemburg, Hohenzollern Candidate, Ems Telegram) and the war and unification of 1870 seemed a tribute to Bismarck's opportunism.

'Coal and iron' refers to the economic revolution experienced by Prussia. The Zollverein was the customs union which founded Prussian power. Industry and commerce developed dramatically, population increased and the wealth generated underwrote the vast increase in Prussian military might (note the Manteuffel and von Roon reforms). Industrialisation and commercial success attracted other German states and they began to look to Prussia for political as well as economic leadership. The answer requires detail on Prussian economic development, the Zollverein itself, railways, coal, iron, steel, textiles, Rhineland/Ruhr resources and heavy industry. Prussia's economic strength contrasted with Austrian weakness and Keynes thought such imbalance was responsible for Prussia's eventual success as it explained its military effectiveness and heightened sense of national identity and mission.

Level 1 answers will have fragments of diplomacy and/or economic developments. Level 2 answers will have greater coverage with some imbalance when treating the two themes. Unqualified 'master plan' approaches would not normally get beyond Level 2. Level 3 answers will have a more extensive range of material on the economic and diplomatic dimensions with

some reference to their relative importance. There might still be some imbalance. Level 4 answers will have comprehensive coverage of the themes with good balance. Developed material on the debates about Bismarck's intentions and the roles of diplomacy and economic development in the unification process are level 4 characteristics. Level 5 answers will be as Level 4 but with independent judgement about the importance of these factors in unification. This could include awareness of their changing importance over time.

Question 10

'The German Empire of 1871 was disunited both economically and politically.'
How valid is this view? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Economic Factors

Superficially Germany was economically united through the Zollverein. The Zollverein had laid the foundations for German industrialisation and the 20 years prior to unification had witnessed uninterrupted economic growth and urban growth. The growth of the railways (over 11500 km of track by 1860) ensured quick transportation of goods and communication between the states. Unification and the French indemnity encouraged an economic boom, while the newly gained iron ore of Lorraine stimulated the growth of the heavy industries. However, there was an East/West divide, with the East of the new Empire dominated by the agricultural land of the Junkers and the West by heavy industry.

Political Factors

The new German Constitution preserved Prussian power because of its majority in the Bundesrat, and the Reichstag was denied executive power. The Prussia take over was opposed, especially in the southern states. The separate kingdoms of Bavaria and Saxony feared for their survival in a Prussian dominated Germany. Left liberals opposed Bismarck and his destruction of civil rights; for them Prussian nationalism had destroyed individualism.

Other Factors

There were social divisions. The growing urban working class showed support for the Marxist SPD and its language of class struggle. Such urban and industrial areas in the west were unfamiliar to the East Elbian, agricultural (Junker) elites who exercised political power. Many of these elites had opposed the creation of the new Empire because they saw the industrialising west as a threat on social (and cultural), economic and political grounds. Prussian 'Junkerdom', facing hostility from the left, established an authoritarian state to secure its survival and placed the Prussian army elite at its heart as a symbol of such political and social divisions.

Religious Factors

This was a major weakness for the new Empire. Catholics, represented by the centre party, (especially in Bavaria, Polish areas and the Rhineland) were a minority in a Protestant dominated state and suffered persecution (Kulturkampf). The small Jewish community was also regarded with hostility and suspicion.

Level 1 answers will make assertions to either support or dispute the statement. At Level 2, candidates may be more secure about their support for or against the statement with some clear support. Level 3 answers will have a good range of material but will lack some balance. Level 4 responses will be balanced, with a secure range of evidence. At Level 5, candidates will demonstrate clear judgement as to what extent they agree/disagree with the statement.