



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 1: HIS1K

Russia and Germany, 1871–1914

Mark Scheme

2009 examination – January 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 © 2009 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.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

January 2009

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1K: Russia and Germany, 1871–1914

Generic Mark Scheme

Question 1(a), Question 2(a) and Question 3(a)

- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Question 1(b), Question 2(b) and Question 3(b)

- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Question 1

(a) Explain why the SPD (German Socialist Party) grew in strength between 1875 and 1890. **(12 marks)**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Indicative content

The SPD was formed as a national party at the Gotha conference of 1875, combining the moderate ADAV led by Ferdinand Lassalle with the Marxist SDAP led by August Bebel. The rise of the socialists was partly a reflection of the consequences of unification in 1871 and partly a reflection of the growing impact of industrialisation, for example poor living conditions caused by urbanisation. The SPD got 500 000 votes in the 1877 Reichstag elections and steadily increased its vote in subsequent elections, rising to 1.4 million in 1890. In 1878, Bismarck passed the Anti-Socialist laws, which were renewed every three years until 1890 when they were allowed to lapse. Candidates may choose to turn this into a reason why socialism grew – it is often claimed that legal harassment of the SPD actually strengthened its support. Other reasons could include the growth of trade union activity, as more and more workers were concentrated into factories in rapidly expanding urban sector, and the trend towards larger factories and more concentration of the work force.

(b) How successful was Bismarck in dealing with internal opposition in the years 1871 to 1890? **(24 marks)**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Indicative content

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence that suggests Bismarck's government was successful in neutralising internal opposition against the evidence that suggests otherwise. One feature of good quality answers may be the ability to differentiate – between aspects of failure as against success; or assessing changes over time (such as success for the alliance with the Liberals at first but less so later). Answers should deal with more than one factor in 'opposition' – some, if not all of the SPD, Catholic Centre Party, Liberals, national minorities and elements of opposition to Bismarck from within the Junker elites.

Points which suggest Bismarck was successful might include:

- in 1871, Bismarck was very concerned about dangers to national cohesion in the newly-unified Germany. He was worried particularly at that time about potential opposition or disloyalty from the Catholic Centre Party (Zentrum), the Liberals, and national minorities – Poles, Danes, French-speakers in Alsace-Lorraine. In 1875, his worries increased with the emergence of the SPD as a national party
- from 1871, Bismarck relied on Reichstag support from some, though not all Liberals. This meant following policies, such as free trade, that seriously provoked the conservative Junkers, the East Elbian landowners who badly wanted a protective tariff. Bismarck also had to worry about Kaiser Wilhelm I, who regarded him as ‘unreliable’
- this combination of problems led to the so-called *Kulturkampf* from 1873 – answers may view this as a failure, because the Zentrum kept up its voting strength; or as a success because the Catholic leadership was intimidated and was eager to obtain an end to the policy
- in 1878/1879 Bismarck was able to maintain control by switching away from his alliance with the National Liberals. By giving in to demands for a protective tariff he won over some conservative support – the reduced opposition from the Catholic *Zentrum* by pulling back from the so-called ‘Kulturkampf’. Catholic opposition was not a big problem after 1878, and there are claims that the ‘Kulturkampf’ succeeded in the long-term, all the way down to 1933
- Conservative opposition was only important while Bismarck was there – not after 1890
- the Liberals were weak and divided and the National Liberals tended to be very patriotic and supportive of many conservative policies and attitudes
- it can be argued that the anti-socialist laws were reasonably successful in maintaining political control in the 1880s, but this is not a given – the opposite case can be made
- Bismarck’s introduction of ‘state Socialism’, ‘killing socialism with kindness’, probably helped to ensure that Socialists were never able to undermine his position
- throughout the period 1871 to 1890, the Reichstag was constitutionally weak and could not challenge the exercise of power
- the SPD was actually much more moderate in practice than its ideology. (In 1914, a massive majority of the SPD supported the idea of national unity and voted in favour of extra war expenditure in the Reichstag)
- the army kept a lot of prestige and political influence.

Points which suggest Bismarck was not successful might include:

- the Social Democrats were not suppressed by the Anti-Socialist Law and were able to form a vociferous opposition group in the Reichstag. By 1890 they were taking 25% of the popular vote in industrial areas. (In 1912 they made an electoral breakthrough and became the biggest single party in the Reichstag)
- ‘Killing socialism with kindness’ from 1883 was not a complete success – support for the SPD stayed strong, and policy was very unpopular with industrialist and traditional conservatives
- in abandoning the Liberal alliance in 1878, Bismarck turned the Liberals into opponents. They increasingly joined the Catholic Centre Party – also classed as ‘reichsfeinde’ – to oppose Bismarck’s measures
- Bismarck struggled to get the Reichstag to pass his budgets
- Bismarck lost political control as the advent of a new young Kaiser brought his dismissal – the Kaiser started his ‘New Course’ from 1890
- it’s obvious they were not successful because the ruling elites were permanently paranoid about the threat of socialism before and after 1890
- the *Kulturkampf* was also a failure, shown by the continuing growth of the SPD.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why Alexander III decided on a policy of repression. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Indicative content

Alexander III combined a policy of rapid, state-led economic expansion with political repression. At the start of Alexander III's reign in 1881, the reforms of Alexander II, begun with the Emancipation of 1861, had proved only partially successful. By 1878, the reforms of the Tsar Liberator were running into serious trouble. He was subjected to several assassination attempts before the one that got him in 1881. It can be argued that Alexander III inherited an unstable situation after his predecessor had aroused unrealistic hopes and provoked opposition, both from below and from conservative and aristocratic elements. The assassination of the Tsar convinced Alexander III that it was time for a different, harsher policy. The new Tsar was temperamentally different from his predecessor and was convinced that the perceived weakness of Tsarist rule had encouraged the growth of unrest – a firm hand was needed. Alexander III also wanted rapid economic modernisation to enable Russia to support its rising population and to maintain its status as a great power. But industrialisation intensified many of Russia's problems and led to increased opposition. To deal with this, Alexander III strengthened the police and security system and also strengthened the basis of aristocratic rule through the use of Land Captains. Candidates may be able to specify various elements of opposition – liberals, populists, narodniks etc – and also show awareness of the methods used to repress opposition; but the main focus of the question is on motives – on the reasons why Alexander III turned to repression in 1881 and carried on with it throughout his reign. Candidates may mention the impact of Pobedonostev as Alexander's tutor and then adviser.

- (b) How successful was the Tsarist regime in achieving economic prosperity in the years 1894 to 1914? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Indicative content

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest it was successful against others which do not. Of course, there was not complete success – there was a terrible economic depression c1890–1905, radical revolutionary movements like the SRs and the SDs were formed in the late 1890s, and there was widespread revolution in 1905, from liberals, revolutionary peasants and workers, and national minorities. After 1906, there were many violent strikes such as the Lena River goldfields strike of 1912 and growing political opposition to Tsarism. Against this, however, it can be strongly argued that Witte followed through massively successful economic policies getting growth rates of 9% per year in the 1890s, that the depression from 1900 was no more than the growing pains of the industrial economy, and that even after the 1905 revolution (caused by the Tsar and some stupid ministers like Plehve, not by structural failings) there was genuine economic progress. As soon as the Tsar went back to clever and capable ministers like Witte in 1905 and Stolypin in 1906–1911, most of the problems melted away and Tsardom was reasonably politically stable and with a lot more economic prosperity. There were railway expansion, growth in heavy industry and the beginnings of the emergence of the middle class. Candidates may mention

that many historians argue that Russia was industrialising rapidly in the years before 1914, to the point where the German generals were afraid of Russian military potential. Others claim Stolypin's agrarian reforms were already proving effective by the time of his death in 1911. One feature of the better responses may be the ability to differentiate – between the Tsar as opposed to the ministers, or between periods of failure and periods of success.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why Germany intervened in the Bosnian Crisis of 1908. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Indicative content

The Bosnian Crisis began with the secret agreement between Aehrenthal and Izvolsky at Buchlau Castle in September 1908 – more precisely with the way that agreement unravelled soon afterwards, because of the storm of protest following the annexation of Bosnia. In this crisis Austria-Hungary was under heavy pressure from Turkey, Serbia and Russia – Serbia's main ally. The crisis ended with Germany (specifically the Kaiser) giving wholehearted support to Austria and virtually bullying Russia into backing down. Coverage of the Bosnian Crisis itself could be made relevant but the key issue in this question is the role and intentions of Germany in resolving a crisis that did not directly concern Germany at all, at least when it began. Before the Bosnian Crisis blew up in 1908, there were few issues causing tension between Russia and Germany. From 1872 Russia had been part of the Three Emperors' League with Germany and Austria-Hungary. Although the *Dreikaiserbund* ended in 1887 and Germany's Dual Alliance with Austria-Hungary (linking Germany to Russia's major rival in the Balkans) put Russian-German relation under strain, Bismarck was able to avoid confrontation. The situation changed somewhat under Wilhelm II – firstly because Germany began to pursue economic and military expansion in the Balkans, secondly because of the 1894 military alliance between France and Russia – but Russian and German interests did not directly conflict. In 1905, Wilhelm II and Nicholas II reached a friendly agreement at personal summit meeting at Bjorko in Finland. When the Bosnian crisis occurred, however, Wilhelm II took a leading role in the aggressive German intervention on the side of Austria-Hungary and bullying the Russians into backing down. Answers should focus on explaining the motives for this intervention. Many responses will focus on the longer term factors concerning the alliance system and German ambitions in the Balkans; others will look more at short-term factors including the personal role of Wilhelm II and possibly including recent failures such as the Moroccan Crisis 1905 and the Anglo-Russian entente 1907.

- (b) How important were developments in the Balkans in shaping Russia's relations with Germany between 1909 and 1914? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Indicative content

Candidates should show some awareness of the situation in and before 1909 – of the overall relationship from 1894 (the year Nicholas II succeeded in the throne and the French-Russian military alliance was confirmed) to the Bosnian Crisis of 1908–1909, when Germany and Russia

nearly went to war over a crisis that began with an incident in the Balkans and ended in Germany's unconditional support for Austrian policies against Serbia and, indirectly, Russia. Relations between Germany and Russia were good enough before 1908 – including the personal agreement between Wilhelm II and Nicholas II at Bjorko in 1905. From 1909, however, relations were frequently tense, with growing fears of Russia and Germany being drawn into conflict in a European war as actually happened, after another Balkan crisis, in the summer of 1914.

Some answers may place much emphasis on developments in the Balkans, seeing these as the most important factor of all. These answers if supported and balanced, can be rewarded at the highest levels. There was the growing involvement of Germany in military and diplomatic links with the Ottoman Empire; the increased tension between Germany's Austrian ally and Serbia, with its close links to Russia; and above all the July Crisis of 1914 when failure to reach any German-Russian agreement led to full scale war. All these factors revolved around the Balkans – the Balkan Wars of 1912–1913, Serbian resentment of Austria-Hungary, the assassination at Sarajevo. On the other hand, answers may give more weight to other factors – such as a deliberate German plan for a war of aggression, or German fears of Russian military modernisation in the years up to 1914. The depth of evidence applied will vary according to the balance of the argument – if the answer is 'yes', the Balkans was ultra important, there will need to be a lot of evidence about events in the Balkans in 1909–1914; if the answer is focused on 'other factors' there will need to be a lot less detail on the Balkans but the issue must still be covered