



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 1: HIS1K

Russia and Germany, 1871–1914

Mark Scheme

2010 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 © 2010 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 2010

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1K: Russia and Germany 1871–1914

Question 1

- (a) Explain why Bismarck resigned as German chancellor in 1890. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

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. **1-2**

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**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Bismarck resigned in 1890.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- The focus of this answer is on explanations of why the accession of a new German Emperor, in particular the accession of Wilhelm II, led to Bismarck's departure after decades of dominance. Some candidates may mention the possibility that the liberal Friedrich III might have posed a threat to the dominance of Bismarck, who had held sway over the empire because of the almost unconditional support of Wilhelm I. Given

that the Kaiser had the right to appoint and dismiss Chancellors it was possible that any new ruler might not have been willing to accept Bismarck's control.

- Chancellors not leaders of majority parties in Reichstag. Bismarck was facing problems in gaining a majority of the Reichstag.
- The new Kaiser Wilhelm II was a particular problem because of his beliefs and personality, he actually wished to rule, which meant that he was unlikely to allow Bismarck to continue his complete control of German policies. Candidates may develop this point by mentioning the debate around the impact of the Kaiser's personality and possible mental health problems, however any such mention should be brief and to the point. Candidates may also make links between these explanations and the events that led to Bismarck's resignation in 1890.
- Wilhelm and the Chancellor differed in interpretation of their own roles in government, and also on policy issues. Faced with a miners strike in the Ruhr in 1889 the Kaiser wanted a policy of reconciliation and prepared a programme of reforms. Bismarck planned a different approach, wanting to make the anti socialist laws permanent. This led to a clash in the royal council and in the Reichstag elections where Bismarck's supporters lost many seats leaving him without the support of either the monarch or the Reichstag. Candidates may use these events to explain how policy differences helped lead to Bismarck's fall, and/or to explain the vulnerable nature of Bismarck's position.
- A further explanation is Bismarck's actions when faced with the opposition of the Kaiser. He was far from diplomatic, using tactics which were a key factor in Wilhelm's final demand for his resignation. He refused to counter-sign the Emperor's proclamation of new social reform, quarrelled with Wilhelm on the right of ministers to advise the Emperor, and revived an old order from 1852 which forbade ministers from approaching the Kaiser unless they went through the Chancellor. Bismarck's reaction to Wilhelm's refusal to accept this was unreasonable, including nearly throwing an inkpot at the Kaiser. Wilhelm then requested and received the Chancellor's resignation. Can mention foreign policy disagreements.
- To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to prioritise or show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they may explain that the Chancellor was very dependent on the support of the Emperor. This meant that Bismarck was in a very difficult position when he had disagreements with the new Emperor about how Germany should be governed and about policy itself.

- (b) How important was Wilhelm II's influence on German domestic policies in the years 1890 to 1914? (24 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-6**
- 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**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates should be able to reach a judgement by balancing points which suggest that Wilhelm II was an important influence against those which suggest that he was not.

Factors suggesting Wilhelm II was important might include:

- candidates should have awareness of the role of the Emperor under the Imperial constitution. He had the power to appoint and dismiss chancellors and control over foreign policy if he wished to exercise this
- Wilhelm wished to rule, this meant that the dominant chancellor, Bismarck had to go if the Kaiser was to have a greater role in government. The dismissal of Bismarck and the appointment of Caprivi is an example of the Kaiser exerting influence on government
- the liberal policies followed by Caprivi can be seen as being influenced by the Emperor, and Wilhelm's change of course away from these policies certainly influenced Caprivi's dismissal. Candidates may also debate the influence of the Kaiser on his other chancellors, examples that may be used are the downfall of von Bulow after the Daily Telegraph incident. Some candidates may have various quotes from the Kaiser, 'There is only one person who is master in this empire', etc
- students may make some mention of influence on foreign policy but these references should be mainly to illustrate the role of the Emperor rather than to discuss the actual policy. Likewise students may mention the Kaiser's enthusiasm for the naval race and for the army, the Zabern incident may be quoted to show interference in government exercised in favour of the army.

To reach the higher levels candidates should focus on the question to reach a judgement much on the importance of Wilhelm's influence. Some candidates may consider factors suggesting importance/lack of importance but a well-supported argument focusing on importance can reach the higher levels.

Factors suggesting that Wilhelm II was not important might include:

Candidates may challenge the importance of the role played by Wilhelm, and refer to the description of him as a shadow emperor.

- Caprivi certainly had a mind of his own and von Bulow used flattery of the Kaiser to follow his own policies
- likewise there were other factors affecting the government of Germany, the rise of the SDP and opposition in the Reichstag can be put forward as can the other interest groups such as the Prussian elites and the growing business interests
- students may refer to historical debate on Wilhelm's erratic personality, which could be used to show influence or a lack of real impact, although this is not required.
- Wilhelm actually had very little impact on domestic policies – his desire to crush socialism was defeated by the Reichstag.

Question 2

- (a) Why did Russia experience rapid industrial growth in the 1890s? (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-2**
- 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**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Russia experienced industrial growth in the 1890s.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- overall the role of Witte
- the development of railways created industrial demand, and opened up new markets for industry
- protection of the domestic market, provided by the introduction of tariffs helped industry to grow
- the creation of a new and stable currency fixed to the gold standard and supported by gold reserves at home encouraged foreign investors providing much needed capital for the development of Russian industry
- candidates should be able to explain how each of these factors led to the development of the economy.

To reach the higher levels candidates may prioritise or link the factors together as part of an organised government policy. Candidates may well refer to the role of Witte in these changes. Better answers will explain how government policy provided a coherent strategy, and may explain why these policies were necessary.

- (b) How successful was the Tsarist regime in dealing with the political impact of economic change in the years 1894 to 1914? (24 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-6**
- 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**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points that suggest that the Tsarist Regime was successful in dealing with the political impact of economic change against those that suggest that it was not.

Factors suggesting that the Regime was successful might include:

This question aims to build on the knowledge of economic changes used in question (a).

- there was considerable economic progress, Witte's policies were largely responsible for Russia's 'Great Spurt' of growth in this time period. There were many more job opportunities as Russia modernised
- the Regime was able to survive the attempted revolution of 1905, and some may say that Tsarism was relatively stable by 1914, and there appeared to be little chance of success for revolutionary parties
- concessions such as the October Manifesto, the era of the Dumas and the agricultural reforms of Stolypin show that the regime was able to deal with the unrest. Stolypin's reforms attempted to deal with the grievances of the peasantry and a prosperous peasant class was created

Factors suggesting that the Regime was not successful might include:

- economic progress often had a negative impact on the living conditions of the Russian poor. Immediately, there were famines in the early 1890s which caused about half a million deaths between 1891 and 1892
- import duties and indirect taxation had a detrimental impact on living standards for the poor
- conditions in factories were dreadful, with brutal discipline and low wages. Living conditions in the towns were dreadful and bred resentment and political unrest
- at the turn of the century there was another famine in the Volga region and the onset of an industrial slump made matters worse. Agriculture was desperately in need of modernisation, and many peasants supported the Social Revolutionaries
- workers moving into towns meant that they were more exposed to revolutionary parties and the activities of trade unionists who became increasingly active, this and the attempted revolution of 1905 show that the government was failing to deal with economic hardship
- by 1912 the number of strikes was increasing again.

To reach the higher levels candidates should consider evidence that the regime was successful/not successful to produce a balanced argument. There should be an element of judgement.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why the Reinsurance Treaty was signed in 1887. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-2**
- 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**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the Reinsurance Treaty was signed in 1887.

- the Dreikaiserbund had offered Germany a way to maintain peaceful relations between Austria-Hungary and Russia. However, the impact of the Congress of Berlin had damaged relations between Russia and Germany, and Bismarck wished to build upon Germany's relationship with Austria-Hungary. This led to the Dual Alliance of 1879. The Dreikaiserbund was renewed again in 1881 but further Balkan crises led to the refusal of the Russian Tsar to renew in 1887
- in order to continue friendly relations between Russia and Germany and to retain some control over Russia as well as Austria-Hungary, Bismarck orchestrated the Reinsurance Treaty. From the German point of view this treaty was part of Bismarck's aim to be the mediator between the two powers in case of hostilities. Candidates may point out that the treaty was Bismarck's attempt to maintain his system of alliances and to maintain control over the activities of other powers
- from the Russian viewpoint the Treaty enabled Russia to avoid diplomatic isolation.

To reach the higher levels, candidates need to prioritise/show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they may explain why the failure of the Dreikaiserbund made it important for Bismarck to find some way of maintaining good relations with Russia as well as keeping up the alliance with Austria Hungary.

- (b) How far was Germany's alliance with Austria-Hungary responsible for the worsening of relations between Russia and Germany in the years 1890 to 1914? (24 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-6**
- 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**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points that suggest that the alliance with Austria-Hungary was the important factor in the worsening relations with Russia against those that suggest that it was not.

Factors suggesting that the alliance with Austria Hungary was responsible for worsening relations might include:

- the Reinsurance Treaty was Bismarck's attempt to avoid choosing between the interests of Russia and Austria-Hungary in the Balkans. In 1890 Caprivi refused to renew the Reinsurance Treaty on the ground that it was incompatible with Germany's obligations to Austria-Hungary. Isolated within Europe, and keen to use improved relations to assist economic development, Russia came to agreement with Republican France, which combined with Germany's increasing commitment to the Triple Alliance led to the division of Europe into two alliance blocs
- defeat in the Russo-Japanese war turned Russia's attention back to Europe and the Balkans after 1905. It was this renewed interest in European affairs and the Balkans that really led to hostility between Russia and Germany because it was in this area that Germany's support for Austria-Hungary was to cause consistent problems
- candidates may make references to Pan Slavism and to Russia's support of individual powers such as Serbia. This led to possible conflict between Austria-Hungary and Russia
- reference to the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Balkan conflicts in 1912 and 1913 as well as references to Germany's commitment to Austria-Hungary on the outbreak of war and indeed the declaration of war itself can be used as evidence of the importance of the alliance.

Factors suggesting that the alliance was not responsible might include:

- initially Russia was predominantly interested in events in the Far East, and there was considerable co-operation between the Great Powers in this area
- the alliance with France created the cornerstone of the Triple Entente leading to Germany's feeling of encirclement
- the arms race may also be cited as evidence that relationships between the major powers were deteriorating as a result of militarism
- candidates may point to historical work suggesting that Germany highlighted the Balkans as an area where conflict might arise. This suggests that poor relations between Russia and Germany were not solely because the alliance with Austria-Hungary led to German involvement in the Balkans, but because Germany sought to break out from continental encirclement and saw the region as one where this aim could be achieved.

There may also be reference to the continuing friendly relations between Wilhelm II and Nicholas II, and a consideration that conflict was not inevitable.

To reach higher levels candidates should produced a balanced argument containing some points suggesting that the alliance between Germany and Austria-Hungary was responsible for worsening relations, and that it was not. Answers should contain a degree of assessment and judgement.