

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2006 question paper**

**9697 HISTORY**

**9697/01**

Paper 1, maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began.

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.

The grade thresholds for various grades are published in the report on the examination for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2006 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL - OCT/NOV 2006</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>01</b>

### Generic mark bands for essay questions

Examiners will assess which Level of Response best reflects most of the answer. An answer will not be required to demonstrate all of the descriptions in a particular Level to qualify for a Mark Band.

In bands of 3 marks, examiners will normally award the middle mark, moderating it up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer. In bands of 2 marks, examiners should award the lower mark if an answer just deserves the band and the higher mark if the answer clearly deserves the band.

<b>Band</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Levels of Response</b>
1	21-25	The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material and ideas. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The best answers must be awarded 25 marks.
2	18-20	Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that that a good solid answer has been provided.
3	16-17	Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.
4	14-15	Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be more organised more effectively.
5	11-13	Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.
6	8- 10	Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.
7	0- 7	Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent. Marks at the bottom of this Band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answers usually make at least a few valid points.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL - OCT/NOV 2006	9697	01

**SOURCE-BASED QUESTION: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION**

**'Russia's policies led to the outbreak of a general European war in 1914.'** Use Sources A-E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2-3]	EVALUATION [L4-5]	CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER (e.g. Contextual knowledge)
A	Extract from a secret alliance.	N - a defensive treaty between Russia and France	Y - A reliable source as evidence of the treaty. N - it might not be reliable about Russia's true intentions.	Y - Cross-reference with C to show Russian hostility to Germany. Also with D - a defensive statement about Russian intentions. N - Contradicted by E which claims that Russia and France were aggressive.	Y - Franco-Russian alliance was countered by the Alliance between Germany and Austria-Hungary.
B	A personal telegram from the Tsar to the Kaiser.	N - Nicholas II claims that he wishes to avoid war and urges restraint by Germany	Y - Reliable as a personal telegram and statement of the pressures in Russia by Nicholas II. Also a true statement about Germany's influence over Austria-Hungary.	Y - Cross-reference with A and D. N - Contradicted by C and E.	Y - Friendship between Russia and Serbia, public pressures in Russia. Recognition of crucial role of Austria-Hungary.
C	An official declaration of war	Y - Germany blames Russia for the crisis, especially Russian mobilisation.	Y - Reliable statement about Russian mobilisation N - Unreliable about William II's attempts to mediate.	Y - Supported by E as defence of Germany and criticism of Russia. N - Contradicted by A, B and D	Y - Russia was first to mobilise. N - Exaggeration of Germany's efforts to secure a peace.
D	A diplomatic telegram	N - A leading Russian diplomat blames Germany and claims that Russia had promised not to take precipitate action.	Y - Reliable statement about Austro-Hungarian actions and realisation of seriousness of the crisis. N - Unreliable in claim that Russia was forced to mobilise. Not an objective statement.	Y - Supported by E. Contradicted by A, B, C.	Y - Austria-Hungary was not negotiating seriously with Serbia. N - Ignores importance of Russian mobilisation.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL - OCT/NOV 2006</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>01</b>

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2-3]	EVALUATION [L4-5]	CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER (e.g. Contextual knowledge)
E	A secondary source, based on primary evidence	Y - The author claims that Russia had long been aggressive and that Russian mobilisation started the war.	N - Title supports the view that source is mostly one-sided and seeks to absolve Germany from responsibility.	Y - Supported by C. N - Contradicted by A, B and D.	Y - Russia had Mediterranean ambitions and had a larger army than Austria-Hungary. Russia was first to mobilise. Britain might have been indecisive. N - Underestimates Germany's involvement.

**NB: These responses indicate only one way to analyse and evaluate the passages. Alternative arguments can be proposed, as long as they are soundly based.**

Key: Y and N, i.e. the source supports or challenges the hypothesis.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL - OCT/NOV 2006	9697	01

**SECTION A: THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR I, 1870 - 1914**  
**RUSSIA AND THE CAUSES OF WORLD WAR 1**

**1 Source-Based Question**

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

These answers write generally about the causes of World War I but will ignore the key issues in the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss 'Russia's policies led to the outbreak of general European war in 1914' but might make only general points about the causes of the war. 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 hypothesis.

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, 'Russia's policies led to the outbreak of general European war in 1914. Source B shows that public opinion in Russia supported Serbia fully and that this might result in war breaking out. Source C blames Russia because the Tsar had rejected German efforts to negotiate a settlement and had mobilised his army. Germany was therefore forced to act in its own defence. Source E shows the historical tradition of Russian expansionism. Its army was much stronger than the Austro-Hungarian military forces and the extract repeats the crucial importance of Russian mobilisation in causing the war. Or alternatively, 'Russia's policies did not lead to the outbreak of general European war in 1914. Source A contains the terms of a defensive, not an aggressive, alliance between Russia and France. Source B confirms that the Tsar was anxious to defuse the situation; he tries to persuade Germany to restrain Austria-Hungary, its ally. Source D defends Russian policies and actions. Mobilisation was forced on Russia and Austria-Hungary was insincere in negotiating with Serbia, Russia's ally. Russian concessions would therefore lead to a new European balance of power which would be heavily in Germany's favour.'*

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 Russia's policies led to the outbreak of general European war in 1914. Source C agrees with the claim. The German declaration of war describes the efforts of its government to avoid war and the importance of the steps that Russia took to accelerate the conflict, especially when it mobilised its military forces. Russia had rejected the chance to negotiate a peace. Source E agrees about Russian war-guilt. In the long term, Russia was an expansionist country whose aims could only be achieved by war. It confirms the claim in Source D that Russia rejected to possibility of negotiations but had forced the issue by mobilising its army. On the other hand, Sources A, B and D defend Russia's policies and actions. The alliance in Source A was defensive and would take action of Germany or Austria attacked first. Source B shows the concern of Russia to defend Serbia against Austria-Hungary, a more powerful country whilst Source D is an explanation of Russia's attitude. Mobilisation was forced on Russia especially when Austria-Hungary was so warlike against Serbia. It states that Germany was the first to declare war.'*

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL - OCT/NOV 2006	9697	01

- 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, 'It is more accurate to conclude that Russia's policies did not lead to the outbreak of general European war in 1914. Although Source A describes a secret, not a public, alliance, its terms were defensive and there is no indication in it that Russia was preparing a war. Whilst defending Serbia in Source B, the Tsar's telegram to William II shows his concern to avoid war and is probably a reliable account of his feelings at that point. Source D cannot be taken entirely at face value because it is very pro-Russian, being written by Russia's Foreign Minister to his ambassadors. However, he is correct to claim that Austria-Hungary, Germany's ally, was not negotiating sincerely with Serbia. The statement is also correct that Germany was the first to declare war and that the suppression of Serbia by Austria-Hungary might have led to a change in the European balance of power with Russia being humiliated and Germany triumphant.'*

- 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, the sources can also be interpreted to show that Russian policies did lead to the outbreak of war in 1914. The key event that led directly to hostilities was Russia's mobilisation of its military forces, referred to in Sources C and E. Whilst Source A claims to be a defensive alliance, no international alliance would claim to be aggressive and its secret nature meant that Russia was still reasonably sure of French support against Germany and Austria-Hungary but that Germany might be unaware of the reality of a Franco-Russian military agreement. Source B is a personal plea by the Tsar to avoid war but it shows how inflamed was Russian public opinion, which was important even in tsarist Russia. Source D is correct in claiming that Serbia was the key issue and that the crisis threatened to change the international balance of power against Russia and in favour of Germany. However, the source ignores the crucial step of Russian mobilisation which sparked the final events that led to a general European war.'*

- 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 is evidence in the Sources both to challenge and support the claim that Russia's policies led to the outbreak of a general European war in 1914, the stronger claim is that Russia was less responsible than Germany. Three of the extracts (A, B and D) show that Russia acted defensively and, whilst these sources are not entirely reliable, they are convincing overall that Russia did not seek war. Sources C and E, written from a German viewpoint, ignore Russia's concerns about Serbia and Austria-Hungary. The Serbian issue, referred to in Sources B and D, shows how Germany gave its strong support to Austria-Hungary, a fact which was certain to alienate Russia.'*

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, 'An alternative explanation is that Germany and Austria-Hungary were more responsible for the beginning of the crisis in 1914, because of Austria-Hungary reaction to the assassination of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand. However, Russian mobilisation, referred to in Sources B and D, was the immediate cause of the conflict. This ended any hopes of a settlement through negotiation although it is clear that there was in any case little hope of negotiations and mediation succeeding because of the obstinacy of Austria-Hungary and the support that it received from Germany.'*

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL - OCT/NOV 2006</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>01</b>

### Section B

#### **2 From 1799 to 1815, how far did Napoleon maintain the aims of the French Revolution?**

The key issue is the relationship between Napoleon as First Consul and Emperor and the aims of the French Revolution. Candidates should avoid narratives of the Revolution from 1789 but should show an understanding of its aims. These might be summarised in the phrase 'liberty, equality, fraternity' and involved an end to feudal privilege and absolute government, the introduction of more representative forms of government and socio-economic changes. The Revolution was also characterised by anti-clericalism, the Church being associated with the old monarchy. Napoleon claimed to be the heir of the Revolution. Reference might be made to his Civil Code. This set down uniform rights and obligations in a framework that might have seemed to reflect some of the ambitions of the revolutionaries. However, other aspects of the Code were conservative and his rule was autocratic. The administration, whilst apparently populist in its reliance on plebiscites, was authoritarian in reality. Central and local government were directed by him. Officials were chosen directly or indirectly by him and were expected to implement his policies. Censorship and a police force, headed by Fouché, kept critics and dissidents under control. The Concordat sought to end the rift with the Roman Catholic Church; he recognised the importance of religion. However, the Church did not regain its former powers. To some extent, Catholic clerics became state officials although toleration was allowed to non-Catholics. 'How far...' invites candidates to consider similarities and differences between Napoleon's policies and revolutionary aims. Examiners will not expect an equal balance between these elements - the balance will depend on the weight of the argument - but the most successful answers will explain and assess both. The question is essentially about domestic policy. It might be argued that Napoleon's expansionist foreign policy went further than the revolutionaries had intended and this can be a valid point. However, it does not require narratives of foreign developments. Weak answers that will struggle to deserve 11 marks might be limited to accounts of Napoleon's policies that are very descriptive and partial and do not attempt to make a real link with the Revolution. Answers in the middle bands might also be mostly descriptive but they will make some creditable links. The most successful answers should be very relevant and well organised, showing that the candidates are in control of the argument even if there some weaker passages.

#### **3 Why did the Industrial Revolution bring about important social changes in Europe? (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)**

The key issue is social change resulting from industrialisation. Candidates are required to refer to at two least countries in order to deter them from writing vague essays. However, the references can be brief because the more important factor that will distinguish the better answers will be the quality of the argument. The question asks 'Why..?' and higher credit should be given to answers that are analytical, providing a series of reasons. The most successful answers can be expected to put these reasons into some sort of priority although the priority might be implicit rather than explicit. The most important social changes might be seen as the growth of the urban middle and working classes and the relative decline of the rural upper and lower classes. Industrialisation gave the opportunity for the urban middle classes to prosper. There was a need for investment and the chance for high profits through manufacture and trade. Urbanisation was a feature of the Industrial Revolution. Towns were not new but their vastly increased size caused a shift in the balance of the population. Increasingly larger proportions of the population lived in urban centres. Urban workers and their families on such a scale were a new phenomenon and resulted in considerable changes in towns and social patterns. Meanwhile, the rural poor fell into further decline or migrated to towns to join the industrial poor whilst the landholders struggled to retain their importance, many of them disdaining to involve themselves in industrial activities. Weak answers might be limited to general and descriptive accounts of the move from agriculture to industry; they will show little understanding of social change. Some answers might move to accounts of social change but unselectively: they will not provide reasons or examples. The highest credit should be given to answers that focus clearly on the requirements of the question and show some variety in their arguments, the points being supported by some appropriate factual knowledge.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL - OCT/NOV 2006</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>01</b>

**4 Why were monarchists more successful than the republicans in unifying Italy by 1871?**

The key issue is the contrast between the success of the monarchists and the failure of the republicans in Italian unification. Candidates can be expected to have knowledge and understanding of Cavour, as the most important monarchist, and Garibaldi and Mazzini as leading republicans. The question ends in 1871 and the most successful candidates are expected to show some knowledge and understanding of developments after the death of Cavour in 1861, especially the acquisition of Venetia (1866) and the final incorporation of Rome. Victor Emmanuel II became King of Italy in a monarchist country. Cavour and fellow monarchists did not alarm the governments of other countries and more conservative forces within Italy as much as the republicans. His policies enabled the monarchists to win the crucial support of Napoleon III's France. Britain and Bismarck's Prussia also played their part. The republicans depended more on popular support within Italy and this was shown to be inadequate, especially in the revolutions of 1848-49. Insurrection could not deliver a united Italy. The monarchist state of Piedmont-Sardinia was the richest in Italy. Cavour began public office in ministries handling the economy and he developed commerce, improved the transport infrastructure and strengthened the army. Nevertheless, the contribution of the republicans was not negligible and candidates might note the ways in which Garibaldi helped to unify the south. Mazzini provided the initial impetus. Cavour probably adapted his original intention to limit Piedmont to a northern expansion. Examiners will probably read few irrelevant answers but highly narrative accounts of Cavour alone that end in 1861 will not be able to reach a high mark. However, examiners will not require an even balance between monarchists and republicans for a very high mark. Monarchists can be expected to represent the major part of most answers. Nevertheless, the most successful answers will be able to assess the importance of both groups. They will provide a series of valid reasons because the question asks 'Why...?' and will handle the comparison/contrast effectively.

**5 'Political factors were more important than economic motives in explaining the New Imperialism of the later nineteenth century.' How far do you agree with this view?**

The key issue is the reasons for New Imperialism. Candidates might consider other factors such as 'Social Darwinism' but this is not necessary within the terms of the question. The most successful answers can be expected to explain a series of political and economic factors and weigh their relative importance. There should be a reasonable, but not necessarily equal, balance between the two elements. A discriminating factor will be the inclusion of some appropriate overseas examples; there is a tendency in limited answers to questions on this topic to omit such examples so that claims are general rather than specific. On the other hand, examiners will be realistic in their expectations. For example, the examples might be limited to Africa or Asia. The number of examples is less important than their success in illustrating general claims. Political factors might include fears of losing out in a new balance of power. France might be used as an example of a country that saw overseas expansion as compensation for losses to Germany in Europe. Governments came under pressure from public opinion to win overseas empires even when they were reluctant to do so. Bismarck might be seen as an example of this. Economic motives might include the search for raw materials. Investment sought opportunities to make profits. There was the hope of wider markets. Although many of these economic hopes were ultimately fruitless, they were important in the calls for imperial expansion. Some candidates might make use of historiographical references. These should be given credit when accurate but should not be regarded as substitutes for examples from specific countries and overseas developments.

**6 What accounts for Lenin's success as a revolutionary leader up to October 1917?**

The key issue is the reasons for Lenin's success as a revolutionary leader. Candidates should note that the should end in October 1917. Material on the Bolshevik government to Lenin's death in 1924 will not be relevant. The question might begin in 1903, when Lenin became the recognised leader of the Bolsheviks, and there should certainly be references to the period before 1917. The temptation to weaker candidates will be to write highly narrative accounts of Lenin's career, perhaps even more generally of the Bolsheviks. However, examiners should not dismiss as narrative answers that are organised chronologically. (Narrative is essentially a story that is not linked to an argument.) The problems that faced Lenin in the early years were very different from those that occurred later. Good answers will provide a series of reasons because the question asks 'Why...?'. Candidates might consider his combination of determination and willingness to adapt. He continued to advocate extreme militancy but reacted to events, many of which were outside his control. Examples of this might be the Revolutions of 1905 and February 1917 although Lenin was later to exaggerate his and the Bolsheviks' roles in these. He saw the value of propaganda and 'Iskra', his newspaper, was influential in spreading his ideas. His pragmatic nature was revealed in his relations with Germany during the war that led to his return to Russia. He could be decisive in times of crisis, for example in October 1917. The Provisional Government was increasingly unpopular and ineffective. Lenin used the organisation of his supporters and the weight of mass appeal to seize power.



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL - OCT/NOV 2006</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>01</b>

**7 Assess the claim that Hitler's rule from 1933 to 1939 was 'a popular dictatorship'.**

The key issue is the nature of Germany's rule within Germany. Foreign policy is not relevant to the question. The question begins in 1933 and candidates should avoid accounts of Hitler's rise to power, unless as a brief introduction. Hitler became Chancellor in 1933 and the combination of Hindenburg's death and the Reichstag Fire allowed him to take complete power, especially through the Enabling Law. As Führer, he was both head of state and head of the army in a one-party state. Opponents were persecuted and the police forces were active in preventing criticism and unrest. Candidates can explain the range of groups that were persecuted. But was his rule popular? The evidence to support the claim would include the vast crowds that applauded Nazi displays, as well as the effectiveness of Hitler's speeches and image as a popular leader. Candidates might refer to other forms of propaganda. Very good answers might be expected to consider some signs of dissatisfaction such as the attitudes of some churches. However, most people were won over by policies that appeared to be in the general interest, what their realities. These included public works, an emphasis on employment and the encouragement on traditional German values. Hitler's Nazi government took steps to appeal to specific groups such as the young, families and women. The enemies of the state included the minority groups that were never particularly popular. Communists were feared by the capitalist classes. Nevertheless, there might be some debate about the degree to which Jews were unpopular before Hitler's anti-Semitic measures. No group, including the military, could mount effective opposition. As indicated above, foreign policy as such is not relevant but candidates might point out briefly the domestic implications of foreign affairs, such as the way in which his promotion of German interests proved popular, for example the continued hostility to the Versailles settlement and the Anschluss with Austria.

**8 How important was the impact of Marxism on Europe up to 1939?**

The key issue is the reaction to Marxism. The 'Communist Manifesto' was written in 1848 and 'Das Kapital' in 1867. They formed the basic expression of his ideas. Their appeal stemmed from their presentation of an alternative justification of political and economic structures, which advocated the triumph of industrial proletarian forces and the inevitable decline of capitalism. If explaining the origins of Marxism, candidates should not spend too long on descriptions of the Industrial Revolution. Marxism made an important, but not exclusive, contribution to socialism, which had many followers in industrial societies. Marxism was international in its appeal, a contrast to narrow nationalism. Its intellectual justification contrasted with traditional bases of socio-political beliefs and included hostility to religion and hence to the position of churches. Candidates can use its spread to Russia, Germany and France as examples. Radical political parties applied Marxism. It became a feared ideology because of many of the points noted above. Established interests saw it as revolutionary and subversive. It was also thought to be intolerant of other political beliefs. Autocracies and liberal democrats opposed it before 1914 and the Russian autocracy was swept away partly by Russian Marxists, who then formed a government and a one-party state. Bismarck feared Marxist influence and tried to suppress its followers. Mussolini and Hitler rose to power partly because of the fear of Marxism in Italy and Germany respectively. Whilst apparently similar to Marxism in some respects (for example, they both advocated a form of socialism), Fascism and Nazism saw themselves as very different, especially in the contrast between the internationalism of Marxism and the nationalism of their ideas. Marxism in Italy and Germany threatened the powers of businessmen and other established social classes, backed by the Churches. It seemed to justify disorder (which justified the disorder used by the Fascists and Nazis). Weak answers might be vague about Marxism and uncertain about its development. Moderately successful answers might be very descriptive, recounting Marxist movements in some countries but being unsure about the reasons for reactions to it. Highly successful answers should focus on reactions and the effects of Marxism, using particular developments to highlight the argument. The question asks candidates to take their answers to 1939 to avoid excessive concentration on Russia but examiners will not look for a particular chronological balance in answers as long as the spread is reasonable.