

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level

MARK SCHEME FOR the November 2001 question papers

8697 HISTORY

8697/1	Paper 1 (Modern European History 1789-1939), maximum raw mark 100
8697/2	Paper 2 (History of South East Asia, From Colonies to Nations 1870-1980), maximum raw mark 100
8697/3	Paper 3 (International History 1945-1991), maximum raw mark 100
8697/4	Paper 4 (History of Tropical Africa 1855-1914) maximum mark 100
8697/5	Paper 5 (History of the USA 1840-1968), maximum mark 100

These mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. They show the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. They do not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published *Report on the Examination*.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the *Report on the Examination*.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the November 2001 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced Subsidiary (AS) Level syllabuses.

NOVEMBER 2001

SECTION A: THE SARAJEVO CRISIS 1914

Paper 1 Marking Notes

[Note: all papers are to be marked using the generic marking bands for source-based and essays questions.]

1 Source-Based Question

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES [1-5]

These answers write about THE CAUSES OF World War I but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information / evidence to test the given hypothesis. Include in this level answers which use information taken from the sources but only in providing a summary of views expressed by the writers, rather than for testing the hypotheses.

L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6-8]

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation / interpretation in context.

For example, 'Serbia was responsible for the Sarajevo crisis. In Source A, the secret society calls on all Serbians to wage war on Austria-Hungary. In Source B, the Austro-Hungarian government blames Serbia for terrorist acts.' Or alternatively, 'Serbia was not to blame for the Sarajevo crisis. The Serbian government denies responsibility in Source C and this is supported by the German Field Marshal in Source E.'

L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [9-13]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disconfirm it. However, sources are used only at face value.

For example, 'There is evidence for and against the claim that Serbia was responsible. Source A is by a Serbian secret society which supported violence against Austria-Hungary and Source B claims that the Serbian government was responsible for the crisis. Source D is a confession by a terrorist who supported Serbia. However, Source C shows that the Serbian government denied responsibility and was willing to punish those who had carried out the assassination or to accept international mediation. Source E claims that Austria knew that Serbia was too weak to fight.'

L4 BY INTERPRETING / EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [14-16]

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

For example, Source E shows that Austria- Hungary was to blame for the crisis. It accepts that, although Serbians might have been responsible for the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, the Serbian government was not. Serbia was too weak to wage war on Hungary-Hungary, which was a more powerful country. The Source is written by a German general who had been an ally of Austria-Hungary in the last war. However, he was writing with hindsight after a war that Germany had lost. His view supports Source C, which proves the concern of the Serbian government because it was written two days after the note from Austria-Hungary. The Serbian reply promises to put anybody on trial who might have been involved 'regardless of their rank' and the offer to involve other countries, the Great Powers and the International Tribunal at the Hague, emphasises its wish to be moderate so that the crisis can be resolved.'

L5 BY INTERPRETING AN EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FIND EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [17-21]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both conformation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example, (L4 plus) '...However, some sources do show the responsibility of Serbia. Source A indicates the deep hostility to Austria-Hungary in Serbia. Resentment is felt at the wrongs that Serbs believed that they had suffered in the past from Austria-Hungary and the struggle was seen as one of self-defence. The members of the secret society believed that their whole way of life was threatened and that it was justified to defend themselves by arms. The Source is convincing as the programme of a terrorist group who were Serbian citizens. Source B, an official statement form the Austro-Hungarian government, points out that the Serbian government had done nothing to control such violence against Austria-Hungary. Although Austria-Hungary's reaction was very harsh, it was not unjustified. This is proved not only by the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand but also by the problems which Serbia had caused Austria-Hungary in the Balkans in previous years, such as ...'

L6 AS L5, PLUS EITHER (a) EXPLAIN WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE / SUPPORT IS BETTER / PREFERRED, OR (b) RECONCILES / EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED. [22-25]

For (a), the argument must be that the evidence for challenging or supporting the claim is more justified. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but why some evidence is worse.

For example, 'Although there were many factors involved, Serbia was mostly to blame for the crisis. The terrorists at Sarajevo were Serbians and Source D shows that this was not denied. They claimed that they acted alone but the presence of such secret societies was known to the Serbian government. The extremism of the members of the secret society is shown in Source A whilst Austria-Hungary was justified in its criticism that the Serbian government had done little to control the violence. The Serbian government's response in Source C is less convincing because it was clear that Austria-

Hungary was determined to take a very hard line and therefore Serbia would not admit to protecting the terrorists. The claim is supported by the way in which Serbia had previously supported resistance to the rule of Austria-Hungary in the Balkans...'

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support / contradict) in order to improve it.

For example, '... The sources show that both sides were responsible for the crisis. Austria-Hungary had suffered the death of the heir to the throne and was justified in its complaint in Source B that the Serbian government had done little to curb the activities of dangerous terrorists. Source A shows how dangerous they were. On the other hand, none of the sources proves directly that the Serbian government was involved in the murder although groups of Serbs certainly were. Source D claims that the accused were acting alone and that they did not hate Austria-Hungary but it is the speech of a defendant in a court case and may well not be reliable. The German Field Marshal in Source E claims that Austria-Hungary over-reacted. This is confirmed by the extreme views and tone of the Austro-Hungarian government in Source B. The most convincing claim is that Serbia could have done more to prevent the crisis whilst Austria-Hungary then exploited the situation for its own ends in order to crush Serbia. Austria-Hungary thought it necessary to maintain order in the Balkans whilst Serbia was the most important Balkan country that resisted this influence. The conflict did not begin in 1914 but had been building up for many years...'

SECTION B

Essay Questions

- 2 The key issue is Louis XVI's failure to 'satisfy the demands of the revolutionaries'. The question asks 'Why...?' and examiners will be looking for a series of reasons. The relevant period is from the Estates General (1789) to the execution of the King and the triumph of Jacobins (1793). Answers should be given high credit when they explain the changing demands of the revolutionaries. They were comparatively moderate in 1789: essentially an end to the privileges of the ancien regime. By 1793, the revolution had become more radical. France was to be a republic and extremely radical groups, using terror and force to overcome opposition, came to the fore. Louis XVI reacted slowly to the demands of 1789; he wavered between firmness and conciliation. However, he agreed to the transformation of the Estates General into the National Assembly, recognising the power of the Third Estate. He also agreed to measures such as the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. However, he and his court were not trusted. Proof of his unreliability came with the Flight to Varennes (1791) and there were also the impact of reactionary émigrés and the threats from foreign rulers. Economic hardship and internal unrest, for example in the Vendée, added to the insecurity of the Revolution. The success of Robespierre and the Jacobins made an agreement with the King impossible. Arguments that are limited to accounts of the outbreak of the revolution in 1789 must be given a low mark band. Answers can be given a mark in a middle mark band if they show an adequate knowledge of developments through most of the specified period, supported by some appropriate comments on the role of Louis XVI. The answers in these bands will probably not refer to the

changing demands of the revolutionaries. The high mark bands should be awarded to answers that focus on analysis, explaining the reasons why the King could not solve his problems and reconcile the opposition. They will be quite balanced between a view of Louis XVI and explanations of the opposition.

- 3 The key issue is the similarity in the development of industrialisation and the candidates are directed to use two countries as examples. Answers that are worth one of the highest bands (22 - 25) will be balanced between the two countries and will show clear signs of comparison. Most answers worth 19 - 21 will be well balanced although they will be slightly stronger in explaining one country and the qualities of comparison will be uneven. A greater imbalance would lead to a lower mark. 11 marks or more will require an adequate understanding of one country with an attempt to deal with the other. Answer worth 11 - 16 will be highly descriptive, with some occasional comments and attempts at comparison. Candidates may discuss the involvement of the new middle classes, government policies which encouraged industrialisation, new inventions and technologies, increased demand from a growing population, the encouragement of trade and the importance of investment. There were associated factors such as better communications, for example the railway. Later in the century, imperialism proved to be a relevant factor. However, examiners will not expect a comprehensive treatment of such factors because this is a wide topic. 'How similar...?' should guide the most successful candidates to look at differences. Why did Britain industrialise first? On the European continent, Prussia moved faster than France, putting in place organisations such as the Zollverein which promoted free trade, and there was heavier investment in industrial development. By the end of the nineteenth century, France was also industrialising rapidly but had suffered from changing government policies, especially in the first half of the century. Vague answers, deserving low credit, may only deal generally with economic conditions and will not show an adequate understanding of industrialisation or of particular countries.
- 4 The key issues that are linked are 'the interests of Prussia' and 'not a German nationalist'. The question focuses on Bismarck's aims and deals with the period from Bismarck's appointment as chief minister in 1862 to the establishment of the new German empire in 1871. The least successful answers will contain thin narratives and inadequate arguments. These may well be limited to superficial accounts of Bismarck. The middle bands will probably be largely descriptive narratives of Bismarck's career and policies with some comments on his attitudes to Prussia and Germany. More analysis and explanation of the key issues will be needed for the higher bands. Bismarck was a Prussian Junker and had little in common with German nationalists and liberals. He rejected their methods of politics and speeches, preferring 'blood and iron', on which Prussia could depend. By 1862 Prussia had become the most important of the German states. Reference can be made to the economic power of Prussia, especially through its leadership of the Zollverein. It had an army whose strength was growing and it also had a constitution. Candidates should be given credit when they examine Bismarck's immediate aims, especially to assert Prussian authority over the other north German states. There is a debate about the extent to which he set out to unify all of Germany. His policies caused problems after Austria's defeat in 1866 for those southern states which sought to preserve their independence. The military strength of Prussia was demonstrated in successive wars. Bismarck outwitted Napoleon

III of France and the result was that Prussia became the master of all Germany. Some very thoughtful candidates will examine the establishment of the new German empire, in which Prussia's dominance was evident.

- 5 The key issue is the results of imperialism, that is the extent to which European countries gained. Answers may consider causes but only in relation to their results. For examples, the essays can point out the economic basis of imperialism but more important will be the economic consequences when examining how far countries achieved their aims. The question also mentions 'continental European countries' and therefore British imperialism will not be relevant unless it is used a brief comparison. The selected countries will probably include France, Germany and Belgium. The empires that were developed provided outlets for trade and resources for raw materials. However, some historians argue that these benefits were comparatively limited; the financial profits were not as large as had been envisaged. The imperial possessions also became important politically and strategically because they represented power. On the other hand, these political elements caused problems because imperialism became an aspect of international rivalry between European powers. Candidates should provide examples of international ventures but, because the scope of the topic is wide, examiners will accept for any mark band answers that concentrate on particular regions as examples. These might include south-east Asia or Africa. High marks will be awarded to arguments that are analytical, focused on the question and supported by sound knowledge. Vague discussions, especially when limited to the causes of imperialism, will probably not be worth 11 marks. 11 - 16 will be appropriate for answers that are highly descriptive but discuss the question deliberately either in an introduction or conclusion.
- 6 The key issue is the success of Nicholas II's regime in recovering from the 1905 Revolution. They should provide assessments of the strength of the regime of Nicholas II to resist opposition. Candidates should note the end point: 1914. A test of candidates' ability to see what is relevant and necessary will be the extent to which they refrain from discussing developments from 1914 to 1917. References to the First World War and the 1917 Revolution should be brief, perhaps to round off the argument. Developments can be explained quickly but cannot be part of the main argument in the answer. It will be necessary to specify some of the effects of 1905 but detailed narratives of the uprising will not be required; the better answers will focus on an examination of their significance. Similarly, higher credit will be given when the period from 1906 to 1914 is dealt with in an analytical manner than when the essays include only narratives. The more moderate answers may perceive only the problems of tsarism in 1914: an inefficient economy, reliance on force and autocracy, an inefficient administration. On the other hand, the better answers will understand and assess the resources on which the regime could rely. "The army was loyal and the police were formidable. There were signs that the economy was improving. Opponents were weak and extremists were scattered, including the Bolsheviks. Lenin was in exile; other leaders were incapable of representing a real threat, also in exile outside or elsewhere in Russia. The Third Duma to 1912 had introduced some reforms. The monarchy appeared to have survived largely intact the troubles of 1905. Candidates can assess the significance of the reforms that were promised and the extent to which they were implemented. Although the problems of the tsarist regime were evident in 1814, Nicholas II was still mostly popular and there seemed no likelihood of a revolution that

would topple his government.

7 The key issue is Stalin's success in 'achieving his aims'. Candidates should explain his aims and can consider his determination to secure power for himself, his attitude to government and opposition and his handling of the economy. The question mentions 'in the USSR' and therefore it is unnecessary to discuss foreign policy. The end date of 1939 should also be noted. Vague and very general surveys of Stalin's rule will not be satisfactory. Heavily descriptive accounts with some supporting comments can merit an acceptable but not a high mark. The highest mark bands should be given to answers that focus on an assessment of success - how much did he achieve and in what respects did he fail? - and are able to consider a range of issues. Answers that discuss only Stalin's handling of the economy can reach a middle mark but will be too limited for a very high mark. From Lenin's death in 1924, Stalin was determined to seize power and exercise it in an unchallenged manner. His position as Party Secretary proved crucial. Anyone who could possibly be a rival was removed, for example Trotsky. Other veteran Bolsheviks were purged, for example Kamenev. Stalin also purged the military. Racial and social groups of which he disapproved were persecuted. From 1933 and especially 1936, treason trials became a feature of the Soviet system. However, propaganda was used to enhance the role and prestige of Stalin. He was determined to modernise the Soviet economy and both industry and agriculture saw wide-scale changes. His stated aim was 'Socialism in One Country'. Industry was reorganised through the Five-Year Plans (1928-32, 1933-37, 1938-42). Agriculture was transformed through the policy of collectivisation which involved the destruction of the kulak class. Answers should be rewarded when they consider the extent to which these economic measures were successful. For example, agricultural production did not rise significantly; although industrial output increased, the improvement was exaggerated in official figures.

8 The key issue in the question is the relationship between political change and war. The question offers the opportunity to discuss reasons for political change such as economic developments but essays can be awarded the highest band of marks if they focus narrowly on the key issue. The specified minimum of 60 years is important to avoid candidates writing only about, for example, the First World War and the Russian Revolution and reflects the cross-thematic nature of this question. As guidance to examiners, a narrow period of 20 years would not merit a mark of 11, however well informed the answer. From 20 to 60 years would reduce the marks by one or two mark bands. Candidates might choose the period from Napoleon to German unification or the Crimean War to 1918 or the 1860s to 1939. The moderate answers will probably include descriptions of wars with brief accompanying comments. The quality of such description can take such answers to 16. More deliberate comments will be needed for 17 - 18. 19+ answers will concentrate on political change and will be explanatory or analytical. For example, without detailed narratives of Napoleon's exploits, it can be shown how he brought about political change in France and Europe. The Vienna settlement was a direct consequence of war. This had its effects on the political futures of many European states, for example Germany. Bismarck used war to solve the problems that had defeated the German liberal revolutionaries in 1848-49. War against Austria helped to bring about Italian unification. The First World War resulted in political change in Europe. Whilst most candidates will mention Russia, other countries were affected including Germany with the Weimar Republic and the

rise of the Nazis. Mussolini's fascists are mentioned in the syllabus and might be considered.