



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme

June 2003

GCE

History

Alternative D

Units 1, 4 and 6

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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 undiscriminating 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 undiscriminating 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 AO1.1, 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 (AO1.2), 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 (AO2, 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 characteristics: 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 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

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 importance of images such as this for Napoleon's control of his French Empire. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the painting as showing Bonaparte in a heroic light or undeveloped comment on propaganda. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and political context. Some knowledge of David's painting, the context of the First Consul's crossing of the Alps and the successful campaigns of 1799. The importance of the propaganda value for Napoleon – (Emperor from 1804) as the dashing, successful, young leader of all-conquering French army and Empire. Comment on Bonaparte's desire to compare himself with Hannibal or Charlemagne is Level 2. References to other images deserve Level 2, but candidates can gain full marks through this image alone. **2-3**

- (b) Use **Sources B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Explain how **Source C** challenges the views expressed in **Source B** in relation to the Napoleonic Empire. (7 marks)

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 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.

Target: AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context. Very brief reference to the content of the sources without understanding of contrast. Absence of own knowledge limits answer to Level 1. **1-2**
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to own knowledge. Source B shows Bonaparte implementing the French Revolution's 'ideals of social equality' and removing the *ancien regime*. In contrast Source C shows him as a destroyer of liberal ideas and civic rights. Own knowledge can include limited material on Bonapartist policy as part of the 'Son of the Revolution' debate. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge of the issue and draws conclusions. As Level 2 but more detailed use of the sources and developed awareness of contrast. Source B has detail on the liberal ideas Bonaparte supposedly brought to Europe ('attack on the privileges of the nobility and the power of the church'). Source C comments on the use of censorship and the establishment of a 'centralised Bonapartist state' hostile to liberal ideas and the 'rights of man'. Own knowledge could note that Europe is the main focus of the extracts and provide more on France. The context is the impact of Bonapartist policy (e.g. Constitution and Code) on notions of civil rights and democracy. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance, in relation to the other factors, of Napoleon's treatment of his subject states outside France as the reason for the collapse of his Empire. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO3

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 on *either* 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 description, but will have valid links

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* 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* 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* own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands 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

Answers which explain the collapse of the empire by examining factors other than Napoleon's treatment of the subject states outside of France are equally as valid, as long as they have some brief attempt at balance for Level 3 and above. Level 1 will provide generalisations about Bonaparte's European Empire. Level 2 answers will describe the structure of Bonapartist Europe (e.g. the Confederation of the Rhine, the kingdoms of Italy

and (Naples) perhaps with short comments on Bonaparte's relatives as monarchs. The treatments of the subject states will not be extensively explained. Uneven, general comment might include one or more of the following: exploitation of economic resources, conscription, tributes and taxation as contributes to the French war machine. At Level 3 there will be more detail on the Empire's structure perhaps distinguishing annexed (e.g. Piedmont) and satellite states (e.g. the kingdoms of Westphalia and Italy). There will be more explanation of 'treatment' with greater detail and example from the sources. The Empire served the interests of France and Bonapartist propaganda (Source A) manipulated opinion and maintained popular support using 'censorship and the suspension of normal civil rights' (Source C). French armies destroyed indigenous social and political systems as French needs prevailed (Source B). Own knowledge could include the destruction of the Italian economy, drained of resources from 1806 and the imposition of the Continental system (Spain, Portugal, Russia) leading to the successful resistance to French occupation. The 'Spanish Ulcer' was important in the growing debility of the French war machine. Level 3 answers should have some evaluation of 'mistreatment' as a factor in the Empire's collapse. At Level 4 the distinction between annexed and satellite states might be identified. The former were not so harshly treated as the latter. Level 4 answers should show a comparison of 'mistreatment' with one or more other factors: the disastrous 1812 decision to invade Russia and impose the Continental system on the Tsar; the fading ability of the French army as it increasingly relied upon non-French recruits: the massive loss of life and equipment meaning that Bonaparte's later campaigns did not replicate the stunning victories of earlier years (military tactics are not relevant). Also relevant is the unfavourable diplomatic context (increasing hostility of Russia and Austria after Tilst) and the unending strength and hostility of Britain as creator of the victorious Fourth Coalition. Bonaparte also overestimated his ability to control such a vast empire and fight so many campaigns on too many fronts. He exhausted the French and Imperial economics in the process. Level 5 answers should have a balanced evaluation of a very wide range of factors with judgement about their relative importance.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by the term 'Jacobinism' in the context of the French Revolution. (3 Marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the concept, largely based on the extract. Brief reference to the revolutionary club or its radical republican ideas. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the concept, linked to the context. Reference might include Robespierre's republicanism, anticlericalism and the concept of 'virtue', the club's leading role in the execution of the king, the domination of the Convention and responsibility for the Terror. 2-3

- (b) Explain why the Girondins lost power in June 1793. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements. Short descriptions of popular insurrection and/or the assault on the Convention of June 1793. 1-2

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material. Demonstrates understanding of more than one factor in the removal of the Gironde. Girondins were moderate and wanted to end the revolution and protect property. Jacobins attacked their conservatism and saw them as royalists and traitors obstructing the revolution. Girondist moderation angered the Paris Commune and the *sans-culottes*. The Jacobins were the only group ready to use extreme methods (Terror) to defend the revolution at time when France was threatened with civil war and invasion as the war and the economy worsened. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue or event and prioritises, making links or draws conclusions about their relative significance. As Level 2 with more detail. Comment may also include the background of rivalry. Girondists were disgusted by Jacobin support for the September Massacres and regicide and their leadership of the *sans-culottes* as *buveurs de sang*. Mass support for the Jacobins followed the setting up of the Revolutionary Tribunal and CPS in 1793. The Gironde could not command the support of the *sans-culottes*, especially when the Jacobin finally supported a Law of the Maximum to control prices. Gironde support was provincial: the Jacobins had Paris. This was a balance of power that meant the end of the Gironde when it came to a clash. With the Revolution threatened by war, defection (Domouriez), economic crisis and counter-revolution (La Vendee) it was the stronger revolutionary credentials of the Jacobins that prevailed. **6-7**

(c) “Following the fall of the Girondins the Revolution was placed in the hands of the mob.”

Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answers are excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation 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, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by 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 or 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

The answers involve a judgement on the policies of the Jacobin-led Convention following the overthrow of the Gironde in May-June 1793. The extract assumes that the ‘mob’ (i.e. the Parisian *sans-culottes* and their radical institutions such as the Paris Commune and its Sections) destroyed the creative, liberal phase of the Revolution and led France into its darkest hour characterised by Terror. Critics holding this view refer to Robespierre’s reliance on *sans culotte* support and the repeated surrender to their demands some of which include: the Constitution of 1793, the Maximum, dechristianisation and the excesses of the representatives-on-mission and an *armée révolutionnaire* as they attempted to control a federal revolt and civil war which the Jacobin extremists had themselves caused. The CPS, the Law of Suspects (1793) and the Law of 22 Prairial (June 1794) are part of the descent into barbarism (‘Terror is the Order of the Day’) as the progressive phase of the Revolution was destroyed by a Robespierist dictatorship. Alternatively, the use of radical measures by the Jacobins can be defended. A revisionist case would stress that the *sans-culottes* were controlled (Law of Frimaire, Dec 1793) and used by the Jacobins in order to do what no other political group could do: save the Revolution from its internal and external foes at a time of national crisis. For Robespierre and his supporters Terror and the excesses of popular insurrection were justified by the pursuit of virtue and the defence of the Revolution. Only the Jacobins destroyed reaction and released the common man from bondage. Also the apparatus of Terror predates the acquisition of power by the Jacobins in June 1793. It was the Gironde that established the Revolutionary Tribunal and the *représentants-en-mission*, the *comités de surveillance* and the CPS itself earlier in 1793. This was far from a descent into ‘mob rule’.

Level 1 answers will give generalised descriptions of the work of the Jacobin Republic. Level 2 answers will develop some relevant material on the work of the Jacobins with perhaps references to the Terror and the role of the *sans-culottes* in the radical phase of the Revolution. At Level 3 there will be an idea of the debate about the origins, nature and impact of radicalism with some knowledge of relevant legislation and personnel. Level 4 answers will provide very good coverage of the period with a good regard to the debate for and against the policies of Robespierre and the Jacobin-dominated CPS. Level 5 will be as Level 4 answers with extended judgement of the Jacobins within the context of the Revolution with perhaps some questioning of June 1793 as the turning point that conservative historians identify.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “balance of power” in the context of the aims of the Great Powers at Vienna in 1815. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term largely based on the extract. Brief, general reference to the elimination of an over-mighty power capable of dominating Europe or undeveloped comment on a peace dependent on mutual respect and equality or power. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term linked to the context. The Powers feared further French domination of Europe and redrew frontiers accordingly. Austria and Russia gained territory and Prussia was given the Rhineland, Piedmont was enlarged and the Kingdom of the Netherlands created. ‘Legitimate’ rulers were restored (e.g. in Italy and France itself). Threats to the balance of power were apparent especially in

eastern and central Europe. Russian demands for Poland provoked alarm and Prussian gains threatened the power balance in Germany. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the Great Powers at Vienna “did not want great changes”. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the events through general and unsupported statements. Undeveloped comment on the conservatism of the powers. Perhaps very general references to the need for peace and stability. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material. Demonstrates understanding of more than one factor explaining how the autocracies (Russia and Austria particularly) wanted to restore the *ancien regime* and legitimism, in order to counter new ideas of liberalism and nationalism, and re-establish traditional authority severely tested by the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue or event and prioritises, making links or draws conclusions about their relative significance. More developed explanation of the liberalism and nationalism the Powers perceived as threatening is Level 3. Perhaps comment on multi-national states, such as Austria and Russia, fearing demands for national independence. France (Talleyrand) supported conservative priorities in order to preserve the restored Bourbons. Metternich used legitimism as a means of restoring Habsburg power (in Italy) after defeats by Napoleon had seriously threatened Austria’s status as a Great Power. Yet changes were made at Vienna. The King of Saxony lost land to the *Realpolitik* of the Russia/Poland question. The Bund, for example, was designed to avert the creation of a strong German power in central Europe and the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Piedmont formed as an anti-French *cordon sanitaire*. **6-7**

- (c) “The Congress of Vienna deserves more criticism than praise.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation 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, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

- L3: Demonstrates, by 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 or 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

Criticisms of the Congress of Vienna are concerned with subordination of the needs and desires of the peoples of Europe to the priorities of the Great Powers ('bartering the future of millions with a scented smile'). Critics have focused on the failures to recognise the claims of Germans and Italians for national independence and the ignoring of the liberal ideals of parliamentary government and constitutional forms important since 1789. The period 1815 to 1848 is labelled the 'Age of Revolution' (Hobsbawm) indicating that liberal-national feeling had been ignored at Vienna to create great problems thereafter. The restoration of dynasties represented a return to a political barbarism which further increased liberal opinion in Europe after 1815. Territorial changes sacrificed national feeling for political expediency: Austrian and Russian acquisitions are thus criticised. The new Europe is also criticised because it became Austria's responsibility to bear the burden of its maintenance and this it was too weak to exert.

The defence of the Congress concludes that the force of liberalism and nationalism were not as strong as the critics of Vienna make out. The German and Italian nationalism, for example, was weak (and beyond the masses) and hardly of strength to register at Vienna. Liberalism and nationalism were linked in the minds of the peacemakers to the excesses of the French Revolution. Even so some constitutions were granted (in France and German states). It is possible that nationalism might not have been the force for liberalism its defenders assume. Later forms were the source of bitter conflict that destroyed Europe. The caution at Vienna seems legitimate. The French threat dominated and the balance of power was designed to prevent the rise of another Napoleon. Each Great Power had needs which translated into a defence of their power and status in Europe and it followed that the treaty reflected this. There was no major war involving the peacemakers until the Crimean conflict 40 years later and no continental-wide war until 1914. 1815 is now compared favourably with the flawed Versailles Treaty of 1919. No power in 1815 was sufficiently aggrieved to work for the destruction of the new European structure and this is to its credit.

Level 1 answers will probably note Congress attendance and give incomplete comments on decision. Level 2 answers will have more extensive material on what was decided at Vienna. Level 3 answers will address questions of criticism and praise but perhaps with imbalance. There will be some extended material on the work of the Congress, whilst not providing full analysis. Level 4 answers will have a strong context and provide a good range of argument including criticisms and praises. Level 5 will be as Level 4 answers with an extensive range of material and focused, independent judgement about the balance of the argument and coherence of the different points of view.

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 A** and your own knowledge.

Explain what was meant by “class conflict” in the context of French politics in the period of the Orleanist Monarchy, 1830-1848. (5 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification. Brief, undeveloped reference to revolution or unclear comment on social division. 1
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge. Use of the source to comment on the organised working class unrest in the 1830s. Own knowledge could show awareness of some class divisions, (workers, old land-owning élites, peasantry, middle class), and example of conflict; the revolution of 1848 for example. 2-3
- L3: As L2, with developed references to both the source and own knowledge. More developed definition of class as the product of economic and political change. References to Marxist interpretations of, for example, the 1848 Revolution, the July Monarchy (i.e. the ‘Bourgeois Monarchy’), as reflecting class division and conflict. Perhaps understanding of the ‘bourgeois monarchy’, and radical republicanism reflecting class division. Comment on Right and Left in France in class terms. 4-5

- (b) Use **Sources B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

How fully does **Source B** support the explanation in **Source C** of the motives of those who formed the Paris Commune in 1871? (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 to own knowledge. 3-5
- L3: Draws explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc with reference to both source 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 etc in relation to the issue. 9-10

Indicative content

Recognises the contrasting views of the importance of the revolution. Reference can be made to the emphasis in Source B to the revolutionary role of the working classes with perhaps

comment on ‘proletariat’. Source C has a less focused approach providing a wider range of motives from which candidates can comment. Own knowledge can include some of the motives and activities of the Communards, e.g. free education/the defence of Paris against Thiers’ troops. Source B reflects a Marxist view of the Commune which is explained solely as an exercise in class conflict. Source C includes a wider response to the motives of the Commune and thus includes the debates the episode has generated. At the higher levels references could be made to the debatable sufficiency of the Marxist view in Source B. Own knowledge could include more on ‘patriotic’ and the problems of identifying the ‘class’ of those involved.

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

To what extent did the tradition of revolution obstruct the development of republicanism in France in the years 1814-1914? (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the 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 a 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 the synoptic question. It is not necessary to have detailed knowledge of the whole period in the same depth but answers must cover the two themes (republicanism and revolution) and show understanding of continuity and change through the 100 years. The question covers opposition to Republicanism and the latter’s confirmation as the French

government in 1877-79. Republicanism was a factor in French politics from 1814 and in the revolution of 1830. Its growth concerned French conservatives, (social élites, and bourgeois of monarchist, Right or Right-Liberal views), who matured as anti-Dreyfusards in the 1890s (Source D). Anti-republicans feared a revolutionary, republican tradition in which they saw the excesses of the 1790s. The peasantry was a conservative mass, (the Dem-Soc movement of the late 1840s apart), providing ready support for the Right. Republicanism seemed to be 'The Terror' reincarnated. Conservative forces attacked republicanism in 1830 and in the following years to 1848-49 (Source A). The Second Republic was destroyed because it was an attack on property, the promotion of social equality and popular sovereignty requiring full participatory democracy (Source C). Aristocrats (landed élites) and the Church had suffered in the Revolution and were deeply concerned by a republicanism in which they saw Jacobinism and class war. During the Second Empire, conservative/bourgeois élites despaired because republicanism strengthened as attacks on Napoleon III increased in the 1860s. The Paris Commune of 1871 was destroyed by the Versailles government because, according to conservatives it was 'Red Revolution'. The ferocity of civil war in 1871 can be explained by extremes of class division in France (Source B). During the Third Republic conservatives mounted a rearguard action Republican government. Successive crises (Panama, Boulanger) culminated in the Dreyfus case (Source D) which broke conservatism and confirmed the Republic. The anti-clericalism of the Combs government (1902) seemed to secure Republican government from a century of assault from the Right. Now republicanism demonstrated its own brand of conservatism. Extreme republicans (e.g. Gambetta) had little impact after 1875 despite monarchism having failed after the Commune (internal division and Chambord's dithering). MacMahon's defeat (1877) led to the rule of moderate Radicals such as Ferry, Grévy and Clemenceau. If, in the later 19th century, Republicanism secured its unity through attacking the church, and acknowledging socialism ('no enemies to the left') republican moderation belied its earlier reputation as Jacobin. Nevertheless, it had taken a century for the association with 1792-93 to weaken. The Dreyfus Affair rekindled Right (and new Right) opposition to republicanism but the period to 1914 saw Radical-Socialist governments that were neither radical nor socialist. Republicanism had overcome its revolutionary past. Opposition remained but France could not be anything but Republican.

Level 1 will give brief and/or uncontrolled description of republican activity. Level 2 will have a range of republican activity. Level 3 will have a good range of material on republican movements and comment on their revolutionary reputation. There will be more developed references to major republican episodes. At Level 3 the chronological range should be wider with understanding of anti-republicanism with comment on the difficulties faced by republican movements and governments. Level 4 will have extensive coverage of the period with a firm understanding. Level 5 will have comprehensive coverage of both themes. At this level there will be independent judgement of the changing nature of both republican and anti-republican groups, with perhaps an understanding of different forms of republicanism and the growing conservatism of republican government later in the century.

SECTION B

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

- L1: **Either**
Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

Or
Answers 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 1848-71

Question 2

“Mazzini was only a dreamer and propagandist. He failed to contribute anything of substance to the *Risorgimento*.”

To what extent do you agree with this view?

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Mazzini's 'Young Italy' (1831) wanted a democratic, anticlerical and Republican Italy. He joined forces with Buonarroti and, in an open letter, encouraged Charles Albert, the new king of Piedmont, to lead the Italian people to freedom. The link with Buonarroti failed, Charles Albert failed to respond and Mazzini's attempt to foment a rising (1833) within the Piedmontese army was crushed. In 1834 'Young Italy' failed again as Mazzini's depleted force volunteers were defeated by the Piedmontese police. He was incapable of employing reliable lieutenants and organising efficiently. He was a dreamer, an intellectual incapable of coping with the harsh realities of revolutionary action. The movement lacked strength and the attempted revolutions were naïve. His writings were not widely read (circulation was limited given illiteracy) and the masses were not influenced. Also Mazzini the idealist ignored issues such as agrarian and social reform. Membership of 'Young Italy' was not large and after 1843 he remained in exile until 1848. Yet he became a well-known symbol of the *Risorgimento* and inspired others by his devotion to the cause. He kept the issue alive, when after 1834, it seemed completely lost and he had recruited Garibaldi to the cause. His conduct of the Roman Republic in 1849 was remarkable but this was crushed by the French. Such legendary exploits inspired others but Mazzini's cause was weakened by the competition for leadership of the *Risorgimento*. Pius IX, Charles Albert and later Cavour and Garibaldi himself were to lead Italians away from the Mazzinian republican democracy.

Level 1 answers will have unclear and/or short descriptions of the activities of Mazzini. Level 2 answers will have more coverage of the period and Mazzini's activities. Level 3 answers will have evaluation of his importance in the *Risorgimento* as a direct answer to the question. Level 4 answers will have extensive context and evaluation of Mazzini. Level 5 answers will have comprehensive coverage with independent judgement about the place of Mazzini in the unification of Italy.

Question 3

"In the years 1852 to 1870 the progress of the *Risorgimento* was more dependent upon international diplomacy rather than internal political factors."

How valid is this assessment of the success of the *Risorgimento*? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

The question covers the diplomacy of Cavour and the subsequent acquisition by Italy of Venetia and Rome. Cavour's involvement in the Crimean War established Piedmont's international credentials and the later negotiations with Napoleon III at Plombières led to the war with Austria of 1859. The war was not a complete success as France withdrew prematurely. The armistice of Villafranca gave Cavour Lombardy but he felt badly let down

by the French and resigned. Diplomacy had been central to the anti-Austrian initiative if it had not fulfilled promises of unity. Yet Austrian power had been weakened. It is not clear that Cavour and Napoleon intended the unification of Italy. Napoleon's ideas were vague and he did not want a strong united Italy competing with France for European hegemony. Cavour was a Piedmontese nationalist who would take advantage of unification. After Villafranca, northern-central Italy (except Venetia) moved within the Piedmont orbit although British support for this was a factor. Plebiscites in 1860 delivered the area in Turin. These developments were as much the result of internal Italian politics as international diplomacy. Cavour and Victor Emmanuel had achieved rather more after Plombières than Napoleon III thought possible. Yet a major factor was the weakness of Austria. The Crimea had fractured the Holy Alliance and internal economic, political and ethnic problems had debilitated Habsburg ability to control its Italian provinces and sustain influence elsewhere in the peninsula. After 1863 Austria was involved in the German Question and her influence waned further as Prussia increased in strength. The internal dynamic of Italian unification was charged by the Garibaldi campaigns (1860) in Sicily and Naples which drew Piedmont into control of the south. British naval action eased Garibaldi's path to the mainland from Sicily but the creation of a near-united peninsula was the result of internal Italian politics and the outcome of the strained relation between Cavour and Garibaldi. Venetia was claimed in 1866 following the Italian support for Prussia in the Austro-Prussian War and Rome was added as French troops were withdrawn to face the Prussians in 1870. Here again international diplomacy had been the key to the process of unification. This was not the *Italia-faràsè* of Charles Albert but internal developments had an important say in the nature and timing of unification.

Level 1 answers will provide limited description and narrative. Level 2 answers will have valid links to the question and include greater coverage. There should be comment on both internal and external factors if with imbalance. Level 3 answers will have extended context and good coverage of international diplomacy and internal Italian politics thus showing synoptic range. Level 4 answers will be as Level 3 but with more extensive, balanced treatment of the two themes with evaluation of their importance as directed by the question. Level 5 as Level 4 with comprehensive context, independent and critical assessment of the impact of internal and external factors.

Question 4

“An effective leader of Italian unification” or a “reckless man of action.”

Which is the more valid judgement on Garibaldi's role in diplomatic and political developments in Italy in the years 1848 to 1870?

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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 for recklessness. Politics and diplomatic niceties meant little: unification by any means was the 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 arrogance of diplomacy. 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 reckless actions had divided Italians, would provoke international intervention, (especially from France), and an uncontrollable Italian civil war involving Piedmont, the Papal States and Naples. Garibaldi misunderstood the political and diplomatic implications of his hare-brained actions. Yet they succeeded in annexing southern Italy to the already united north. He had rekindled the *Risorgimento* as no other leader 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 Castelfidardo, 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 the capitulation to Cavour showed no understanding of the problems of unification and Piedmontization the south would endure. Garibaldi’s reckless attempts to claim Rome (1862,1867) defied diplomatic logic, were defeated by the French and Piedmontese and embarrassed Victor Emmanuel. Italian diplomacy in 1866 was more successful: the Prussian alliance brought Venetia. 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 man of action who inspired others with his dreams of unity. Whether these were the qualities of the essential leader of the *Risorgimento* is debatable.

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 question’s themes with evaluation of Garibaldi as a leader of Italian unification. Level 4 answers will have independent judgement, based on extensive material, with some discrimination perhaps about the variable importance of Garibaldi during the period. Level 5 answers will be as Level 4 but with effectively sustained judgement as appropriate to the question.

Option B: Russia 1848-81**Question 5**

To what extent did Nicholas I's social and economic policies strengthen the Russian autocracy in the years 1848 to 1855? *(20 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Nicholas observed the 1848 revolutions with horror and attempted to strengthen the autocracy. Domestic policy included the tightening of censorship, (the period is called the 'epoch of censorship terror'), the curtailment of the press and the banning of foreign literature. The Third Section increased its surveillance and opposition groups such as the Petrachevskii Circle were destroyed. Opposition was sustained, however. Westernizers attacked the regime and its conservative supporters, the Slavophiles (whose views convinced the Tsar to strengthen the Commune and extend the influence of the Orthodox Church); critics called for the modernisation of the autocracy on liberal lines. Intellectuals such as Belinski and Herzen attacked Tsarism with the latter calling for socialism and revolution. Nicholas' response was to further control education. Student numbers were reduced (by nearly 30%) and the curriculum narrowed in order to stifle critical studies. Religion was privileged and education made to serve the autocracy as an instrument of control. The institution of serfdom was strengthened and promises to implement the Kiselev/Bibikov reforms abandoned. The landed aristocracy in Russia was also strengthened by Nicholas and it was once more the foundation of the Tsarist system. The privileges of the aristocracy were extended.

The economy stagnated. Kankrin's reforms had not been a success and Russia lacked the railways and industrial growth to keep up with the West. The Crimean War damaged Russia's finances and destroyed faith in the rouble. There was little industrial investment and what technological advances (iron and textiles) that had been made were not sustained. Russia failed to increase her share of world trade. Failure to reform Russia's traditional social structure was an important reason for the economic stagnation. The Tsar had lost touch with his people. Blanket reaction meant that badly needed reforms had been lost. Major problems remained: economic stagnation, the crucial failure to reform serfdom, a bankrupt nobility, the suffocating presence of the police state and increasing opposition in towns and villages which would have led to the terrorism of the following reign. Russia was inefficiently run and failed to maintain loyalty of groups, (the intelligentsia, the small but important middle class and the peasants were increasingly unreliable), upon whom the strength and stability of the state depended. Russia's strength after 1848 was an illusion.

Level 1 answers will give unbalanced, superficial comment on Nicholas' policies. Level 2 answers will have more coverage if still undeveloped. Level 3 answers will have balanced

coverage with an obvious evaluation. Level 4 answers will have good coverage of the material with a strong analytical approach which includes good balance on policy, and the strengths and weaknesses of the regime, in order to come to a reasoned conclusion. Level 5 answers will have extensive policy coverage with independent judgement about the scope for reform in Russia and the condition of the regime by the end of the Crimean War.

Question 6

How far did Alexander II's social, economic and political reforms solve Tsarism's problems?
(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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 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. Reform, despite Alexander's 'Tsar Liberator' reputation, made Tsarism weaker.

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 curricula if education was 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 a 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. Periods of service endured by (serf) recruits were reduced, barbaric conditions reformed and aristocratic patronage removed. If it took decades for improvement, reform of a central Tsarist institution had been tried without being 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 government, economy and society. This was an achievement but Alexander II could not remove Russia's weaknesses.

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 that could balance achievements and shortcomings. 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

How far was opposition to Alexander II inspired by revolutionary political and economic ideas? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Opposition to Tsarism included Polish nationalists outraged at Russification and there was a serious revolt in 1863. The revolt failed as the peasantry was unmoved and Russia maintained control of the cities to defeat a disorganised and outnumbered opposition. The revolt did encourage Alexander to introduce a favourable emancipation edict but continued Russification earned him the undying hostility of Polish peasants and landowners. The Russian intelligentsia (Herzen) was the target of repression as Alexander reacted to peasant uprisings, assassination attempts and Polish revolt. It was provoked into extremism. Nihilists developed revolutionary strategies to destroy Tsarism, Orthodoxy and their social and political institutions completely before building the just society. Populists (*Narodniki*) idealised the peasant as the heart of the new society and economy free from the iniquities of Tsarism and began a 'To the People' crusade in the 1870s in order to encourage socialist revolution and terror attacks on Tsarism. 'Land and Liberty', 'Black Partition' and 'People's Will' developed as a terrorist groups and carried out attacks (e.g. Vera Zasulich) on the Tsar and his officials. These attacks had a measure of popular support as the regime failed to maintain confidence. The reform era had heightened expectations only for them to be dashed. Now opposition demanded political and social reforms to create social and economic

equality, an increase in standards of living and the reduction of privilege, inherited wealth, patronage and the venality that secured social division in Russia. Tsarist police seemed important. Alexander strengthened censorship and extended police powers but what provoked terrorism was the Tsarist political system itself. There was constitutional reform, the 1861 Emancipation had failed, peasants remained impoverished and the *zemstva* emasculated. The Orthodox Church and the Nobility remained, with the Tsar, immovable institutions in a country facing increasing demands for political change. By 1880 Terrorist groups were being penetrated by the Third Section and their effectiveness contained but 'People's Will' terrorists successfully assassinated the Tsar in 1881. Arguably the Tsar's reforms had encouraged opposition to the point of violence, or he had failed to introduce sufficient reform merely wishing to make Tsardom work more efficiently. Ironically, the Loris-Melikov constitutional reforms were being considered when the Tsar died but it is doubtful fundamental political reform was contemplated.

Level 1 answers will give short, undeveloped comment. Level 2 answers will have greater coverage if omitting required evaluation. Level 3 answers will provide good coverage of the opposition groups and Tsarist policies and provide evaluation. Level 4 answers will develop comprehensive coverage of the opposition and address the question of their effectiveness and, perhaps, the question of Tsarist provocation. Level 5 answers will be as Level 4 with independent judgement about the causes of opposition.

Option C: The Unification of Germany 1848-71

Question 8

"The economic obstacles to German unity were more significant than the political."
How valid is this view of the "German Problem" in the years 1848 to 1862? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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 failures of 1848 destroyed constitutional reform and unification based on liberal ideas of parliamentary restraints on monarchical powers. Also gone were *Grossdeutschland* and *Kleindeutschland* plans for a new Germany to replace the Bund. Politically, the revolutionaries' failure allowed Austria to reassert control in Germany and Prussia's position was reduced accordingly. The Radowitz Plan (1849 Erfurt Union) attempted to exclude Austria from a new Prussian-led Germany with Frederick William as king-emperor. Austria revived the Bund and defeated Prussian ambition (and its army in Hesse-Cassel) because it had more political influence in Germany, (Prussian ambition was feared by other German states), and was stronger militarily and economically than Prussia. Schwarzenberg also had Russian backing and the superior Austrian armed forces forced a Prussian climbdown. This was the 'Humiliation of Olmütz' (1850). Prussian political weaknesses were demonstrated as Austria reduced Prussia to dependent membership of the Bund. Economically, however, the

Zollverein was to develop Prussian economic strength after 1850. Prussian industry, transportation (especially railways), and commerce outstripped Austrian capabilities, established a Prussian military ascendancy and altered the German power balance sufficiently for Prussia to recover and develop the power deployed by Bismarck to achieve unification in the years 1864 to 1871. The highly successful *Zollverein* free trade area attracted other German states and developed Prussia's political leadership in Germany. As a response to the *Zollverein* Austria attempted its own Customs Union but it failed. Austria was now outside the economic heartland of Germany and had economic weaknesses (depression, relatively slow industrial growth and commercial weaknesses) making competition with Prussia fruitless. Austria was also diplomatically isolated after Crimea and the Empire faced internal unrest (e.g. in Italy) which further weakened it as a German power. The economic and political obstacles to German unity were, as far as Prussia was concerned, being removed. Manteuffel's reforms (end of feudalism, political repression) in Prussia strengthened the monarchy. The accession of William I gave Prussia effective leadership and Von Roon's appointment vastly improved the army (new regiments, more conscription, new weapons). By Bismarck's appointment in 1862 the economic and political positions of Prussia and Austria had been reversed. Now Prussia was poised to impose its own solution to the German problem but this would wait until Bismarck's leadership after 1862.

Level 1 answers will have short and/or unclear narrative. Level 2 answers will have more coverage of the period. In Level 3 answers there will likely be some imbalance when treating the economic and political issues and develop evaluation of the strength of the obstacles to unity. Level 4 answers will have a very good knowledge of the political and economic trends with understanding of the changes in the relative strengths of Prussia and Austria. Level 5 answers will be as Level 4 but with comprehensive detail and independent judgement about the potential for unification as it developed through the period.

Question 9

“It was ‘coal and iron’ rather than ‘blood and iron’ which secured German unification.”

Assess the validity of this view.

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

‘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 responsible for Prussia's eventual success as it explained its military effectiveness and heightened sense of national identity and mission. Traditional explanations focus on 'blood and iron' and explain unification as the result of Bismarck's diplomacy. 'Master Plan' approaches are now repudiated but will appear in answers. It is Bismarck's diplomacy, that brought the defeats of Denmark, Austria and France, that forms a central role here. 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 Zollparlament designed to pull the southern German states into the Prussian orbit. Southern opposition to Prussia eased because of its fear of French designs on Germany south of the Main. Relations with France deteriorated after 1866 (Luxembourg, Hohenzollern Candidature, Ems Telegram) and the war and unification of 1870 seemed a tribute to Bismarck's opportunism.

Level 1 answers will have fragments on 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 of over time.

Question 10

How united was the German Empire of 1871? In your answer you should refer to political, social and religious issues. (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1, AO2

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

Germany was incomplete because as a *Kleindeutsch* solution to unification it left many Germans outside the borders of the Reich. Germans in Austria for example were excluded. The Reich was politically unstable and unbalanced because Germany was really controlled by Prussia and the Prussian take-over was opposed, especially in the Southern states. The separate kingdoms of Bavaria and Saxony, for example, feared for their survival in the Prussian-dominated Germany. The new German Constitution preserved Prussian power because of its majority in the Bundesrat and the Reichstag was denied executive power

despite its election by universal male suffrage. Political divisions remained. Left Liberals opposed Bismarck's *Realpolitik* and destruction of civil rights: for them Prussian nationalism had destroyed individualism in the interests of Prussian state power. Conservatives were also uneasy (below). Geographically Prussia dominated Germany (2/3 of the territory and 60% of the population) and all essential decisions were made in Berlin, the Prussian capital. There were minorities uneasy at their incorporation into the new Reich. The French in Alsace-Lorraine, Danes in Schleswig and 3 million Poles in East Prussia regarded themselves as victims of Prusso-German nationalism.

Social divisions were important. 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*) élites who exercised political power. Many of these élites 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 élite at its heart as a symbol of such political and social divisions.

Religious division was a weakness of the new Germany. Catholics, represented by the Centre Party, (especially in Bavaria, Polish areas and the Rhineland) were a minority in a Protestant state and suffered persecution. The small Jewish community was also regarded with suspicion. Political, regional and confessional divisions came together.

An alternative view is to stress the strength of the Prussian creation which dominated Europe in 1871. The *Kleindeutsch* option rendered the Reich more controllable and Prussian political and military power was fully established. The Hohenzollern dynasty's position, and Bismarck's political standing, seemed in 1871 to be beyond any serious opposition. Any structural, social or political tensions had, in 1871, only a potential or marginal significance given Prussian hegemony.

Level 1 answers will have very insecure comment on the nature of the Second Reich. Level 2 answers will have coverage of the condition of Germany with possible imbalance when discussing the various themes. Level 3 answers will have a good range of material across the issues with evaluation of the weaknesses in the German Empire. Level 4 answers will have balanced and comprehensive treatment of the three dimensions and a good awareness of the weaknesses possibly with some discrimination. Level 5 answers will be as Level 4 but with extensive understanding of these issues with independent judgement about the balance of strengths and weaknesses of the *Kaiserreich*.

Alternative D: Revolution, Conservative and Nationalism in Europe, 1789-1914**AS/A2 Unit 6: The Crowd in the French Revolution, 1789-1794****Question 1**

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

How valid is the interpretation in **Source C** about the characteristics of the *sans-culottes* during the French Revolution? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

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

Indicative content

The source by Wright comments briefly on the composition of the *sans-culottes*, and the extent of their political influence during the revolution. The composition of the *sans-culottes* is said to be mainly “simple, naïve men”, “uneducated” and there is reference to “their excitability, blood thirstiness”. This interpretation can be supported and to some extent refuted with own knowledge about the composition of the *sans-culottes* as the revolutionary crowd. At the time of the Revolution the *sans-culottes* were viewed as the dangerous classes, the dregs of Parisian society, *burveurs de sang*, but many were small shopkeepers and artisans owning workshops. Some, like Santerre, the brewer and hero of the attack on the Bastille, were wealthy businessmen employing a large labour force. Most significantly some were civil servants or members of the *rentier* class or the professions and therefore educated and politically aware. Own knowledge such as this to illustrate the inadequacies and limitations of the source interpretation should be present in Level 3 and Level 4 answers. Candidates may refer to the concessions that were granted during 1793, e.g. the General Maximum and the creation of the revolutionary armies to argue against Wright’s view that the *sans-culottes* were politically naïve and gullible. Others may support his view and argue that the *sans-culottes* were political pawns used by the Jacobins to increase their own support and influence. The source also claims that the *sans-culottes* provided “the essential fuel for the engine of the great Terror”. Here the popularity of the period of the great Terror can be debated along with the role and influence of Robespierre and his colleagues in the Committee of Public Safety; answers which do this will clearly be Level 3 or above

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

How useful is this source as evidence of the contemporary view of the social and political background of the *sans-culottes*? (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 content 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 each a sustained and well supported judgement. **9-10**

Indicative content

This contemporary account, by a *sans-culotte*, gives a useful insight into the social and political background by the *sans-culottes*. The source dates from May 1793, the eve of the journée which purged the Convention of the Girondins and gave power to the Jacobins. It indicates the passion and commitment of the *sans-culottes* in defending the revolution, but it gives little indication of the bloodthirstiness and violence which the *sans culottes* participated in during the period of the Terror. The language used has moralistic undertones, (the source is taken from a sermon), and answers which appreciate this insight into the social and political background of the *sans-culottes* are clearly L3 and above. A *sans-culotte* “lives quite simply”, without riches or airs and graces, “he is useful” and contributes to society through his skills as a labourer and craftsman, not as leech on society. A hatred of the aristocracy and wealthy is clearly expressed in the phrases “no mansions, no servants” and “not powered or perfumed and all dolled up”. Socially the *sans-culottes* saw themselves as workers, labourers, artisans and tradesmen. Politically, they passionately supported the Republic and were willing to die for their cause, “shed his blood to the last drop”. They supported the war effort “keeps his sword with an edge” as it was necessary to save the Revolution from external and internal enemies. However, the source has its limitations, and the clearer the candidate is about these, the higher the level achieved. The author of the source is unknown and gives a narrow and skewed view of the now recognised wide social background of the *sans-culottes*. As it was originally from a speech it may have been recorded incorrectly, things may have been lost in translation and through adaptation. There is no reference in the source to other political concerns such as the fierce anti-clericalism of the *sans-culottes*, their demands for the right to insurrection, direct action, their concerns for liberty and economic independence etc. Level 1 answers will summarise the points in the source about social and political background. Level 2 answers will comment about the utility of the content within the source. Level 3 answers will have some appreciation of the source’s provenance. This will be well developed at Level 4.

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

To what extent did the *sans-culottes* succeed as a revolutionary force in the years 1789 to 1794? **(20 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the 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 a 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

The *sans-culottes* were a militant revolutionary force. They led the attack on the Bastille in 1789 and the *journées* that radicalised the Revolution. These included the ‘October Days’ (1789) which forced the king to supply grain and endorse the Declaration of the Right of Man and the August decrees. This ‘March of the Women’ also forced Louis to leave Versailles for Paris thus symbolising the ability of the *sans-culottes* to control of the Revolution. They were defeated at the republican celebration at the Champ de Mars (1791) and it seemed that moderates had control. But war from 1792 provoked the most radical phrase of the Republic leading to the fall of the monarchy. The Convention became a vehicle for Jacobin dictatorship. In all these episodes the *sans-culottes* were central. The invasions of the Tuileries (June and August 1792) were provoked by war and fears of treachery. In the 9th August inruption the crowd massacred Swiss Guards in the most violent revolutionary episode. The Paris Commune was now all-powerful and the *sans-culottes* had changed the course of the Revolution: the king’s power was broken. The September Massacres which began the Terror was developed in 1793 by the Jacobins who used the *sans-culottes* as allies. The latter were *burveurs de sang*. The *journée* of June 1793 removed the Girondins from the Convention and was supreme evidence for their revolutionary success. Their champions in the Committee of Public Safety (CPS) included powerful men such as Danton and Robespierre himself. The *sans-culottes* demanded a new Constitution, the right to insurrection, conscription and price control (Law of the Maximum, Sept.1793). They were also a significant force behind the *armée révolutionnaire*, the attack on federalism and the extension of the Terror as a result of the *journée* of September 1793. The Convention was again invaded and radical measures (Law of Suspects) demanded. Militant *sans-culottes*

were in the *représentant en mission* and closely linked with Dechristianisation and the Revolutionary Tribunals. They were the essential instrument of radicalism and at the very heart of revolutionary excess in the period 1789 to 1793. After 1793 the powers of the *sans-culottes* waned. The war was being won and the CPS wanted to re-establish control of the government: *sans culottes'* militancy had lost its currency and the Jacobins cut their links with the crowd, weakened the Commune and dismantled provincial instruments of Terror such as the *représentants*. *Frimaire* (Dec.1793) centralised power in the CP. Robespierre removed extremists like Hébert. Danton was executed for his moderation and the Great Terror of 1794 (Law of Prairial) was centrally directed. The *sans-culottes* had been emasculated by the CPS and they refused to save Robespierre in 1794. They failed to enforce the Maximum on prices (and endured a Maximum on wages), had lost their Parisian base with the removal of the popular societies and could (or would) not riot to save Robespierre at Thermidor. Questions remain about the independence and spontaneity of *sans culottes'* actions and especially the balance of power between them and the Convention. The balance changed as the Jacobins strengthened their hold and then controlled the popular movement. The early *journées* were undoubtedly successful in radicalising the Revolution but after 1793 the *sans-culottes* lost their ability to impose their will.

Evidence from the sources:- the passion, drive, commitment and the unifying factor of the hatred of the aristocracy helped the *sans-culottes* succeed as a revolutionary force up until 1793 (Source A). Source B clearly states some of the revolutionary political success of *sans-culottes*, including elected representatives, introduction of the General Maximum and the death penalty for hoarding. Source C is the most comprehensive about revolutionary success as it refers to the results of their actions in the revolutionary *journées of 1792*.

Level 1 answers will have short narratives of some of the *sans-culottes'* actions. Level 2 answers will have more coverage of the *sans-culottes* linked, if not always securely, to the nature of the Revolution. Level 3 answers will have very good material on the *sans-culottes* and their radicalisation of the Revolution, i.e. outcomes as well as actions. At Level 4 this aspect will be more obviously recognised. Full coverage will include the rise and fall of the powers of the *sans-culottes* with explicit evaluation of success. At Level 5 there will be comprehensive treatment with clear regard for the evaluation required and independent judgement about, for example, the ability of the *sans-culottes* to control the revolutionary dynamic.