

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2007 question paper

9697 HISTORY

9697/01

Paper 1, maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, 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.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2007 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9697	01

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 or 4 marks, examiners will normally award the middle mark/one of the middle marks, 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.

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
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 – October/November 2007	9697	01

Section A: The Origins of World War I, 1870–1914

Source-based question: Analysis and Evaluation

Question: ‘Britain’s attitude to Germany before the outbreak of World War I was unnecessarily hostile.’ Use Sources A-D 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	N- Britain believed in the balance of power. Germany’s reasonable claims would not be opposed.	N-Britain does not seek superiority over Germany but favours a balance of power. Germany’s just rights should be preserved.	N-An official report that probably reflects Britain’s public policy. Y- Memorandum might not reveal British policy fully.	Y-Defence of British policy is supported by D and parts of B. N-Contradicted by C and parts of B.	Y-Broadly reflects British policy. N-Plays down Britain’s suspicions of Germany and is misleading on attitudes to France and Russia, Britain’s partners in the Triple Entente.
B	Y-German Chancellor believed that Britain and its allies were encircling Germany.	Y-Fears by Germany of encirclement. The Triple Entente was dangerous to Germany. N-Britain nervous about losing its naval power.	Y-Writer was an important British politician. Y-Calm tone of the writer contrasts with the extremism of the German politician. N-Written at a later date. Might not be fully accurate as a record of the discussion.	Y-Supported by C. N-Contradicted by A and D. Parts of B do not support claim.	Y-Germany did fear encirclement by the Triple Entente powers. Y-Britain feared growing German naval power: the naval race. Britain did depend on the sea. Had a weak army.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9697	01

C	Y-Kaiser accuses Britain and its allies of being extremely anti-German. Germany had been trapped and was encircled.	Y-The Entente powers (Britain and its allies) were warmongers. Britain had long-term animosity to Germany.	Y-The personal notes of the Kaiser. Therefore probably reliable. Y-The tone is extreme, N-Might not be reliable as a considered view of German and British policies.	Y-Supported by part of B. N-Contradicted by A, D and part of B.	Y-There were secret treaties that undermined international confidence. N-Fears of plans for a war of extermination were unfounded. N-Germany was mostly responsible for the crisis caused by Austro-Hungarian policies in 1914.
D	N-The British Foreign Minister warns Germany but wishes to maintain good relations.	N-British government wanted good relations with Germany and a resolution of the current problem. But they were limited to Britain's desire for peace. N-Britain could not abandon the guarantee of Belgian neutrality.	Y-Writer was a very important British politician. Y-Time of telegram meant that writer was aware of critical danger.	Y-Supported by A and part of B. N-Contradicted by D and part of B.	Y-The British government, and Grey in particular, wished to avoid war. Y-Guarantee of Belgian neutrality was important to Britain.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9697	01

**Section S: The Origins of World War I, 1870–1914
Britain’s Attitude to Germany Before World War I**

1 Source-Based Question

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

These answers write generally about issues before 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 ‘*Britain’s attitude to Germany before World War I was unnecessarily hostile*’ 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, ‘Britain’s attitude to Germany before World War I was unnecessarily hostile. Source B shows that the German Chancellor accused Britain of encircling Germany with France and Russia, its allies. Britain was accused of hating Germany. Source C explains that the Kaiser suspected Britain of making secret anti-German treaties. Britain was seeking a war that would exterminate Germany, which was being encircled by its enemies. Britain’s attitude was not peaceful as it took a sneering attitude to the problems that Germany faced.’

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 Britain’s attitude to Germany before World War I was unnecessarily hostile. Source B agrees with the claim because the German Chancellor was embittered by British policy that would encircle Germany in its alliance system. The alliances with France and Russia were a direct danger to Germany. British policy was based on hatred of Germany. Source C agrees with this view. William II also sees the danger to Germany from a policy of encirclement pursued by Britain. He interprets Britain’s alliances with France and Russia as being dangerous to his country. Britain had taken advantage of the problems of Austria-Hungary to weaken Germany. On the other hand, Source A disagrees with the claim. The civil servant explains that Britain would support Germany’s just claims, including some expansion of its navy. Britain recognised the importance of treating Germany as an independent country that was entitled to defend itself. Source D also challenges the claim. Grey tries to reassure the German government what Britain sought peace and had no hostile feelings towards Germany. He shows concern for France, Britain’s ally, but there is no wish to crush Germany. Grey was anxious to reassure Germany by securing an international agreement that would convince her that Britain and its allies did not have aggressive policies. The British Minister refers to the extent of the dangers in July 1914; he was anxious to defuse the situation. Source B mostly contradicts the claim because Lloyd George emphasised that Britain was seeking peace with Germany. His aim was to convince the German Chancellor and his government of Britain’s best intentions as long as Britain’s basic interests at seas were preserved.’

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	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 Britain's attitude to Germany before World War I was not unnecessarily hostile. Source A can be accepted as an accurate version of British policy at the beginning of the twentieth century. It is an objective account that underlines the importance to Britain of the balance of power. Source B, although written later, probably summarises accurately Lloyd George's views before the war. Although he was uneasy about German ambitions, there is no evidence in the Source that Britain was unnecessarily hostile to Germany. The German Chancellor, not Lloyd George, is seen as extreme in his reaction. This might be a personal view but there is no reason to believe that the description of Bethmann Hollweg is invented. Grey's telegram is reliable as an account of the importance to Britain of defending Belgian neutrality, which was not unnecessarily hostile. He was an important minister and was careful to represent British policies accurately at that moment of crisis. In July 1914, the British government was still anxious to preserve good relations with Germany, which reinforces the reliability of Source D.'

- L5 BY INTERPRETING AND 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 confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example, (L4 plus) '...However, the Sources can also be interpreted to show that Britain's attitude to Germany before World War I was unnecessarily hostile. Source A might seem moderate but does not explain what is meant by Germany's reasonable rights. Source B is written from a British point of view. Source C is extreme in its tone but conveys the unease of many German politicians about British policy. Suspicions about the secret treaties that had been agreed did indeed create unease in Germany.'

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9697	01

- 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 Britain’s attitude to Germany before World War I was unnecessarily hostile, most of the evidence in the extracts challenge the claim. Source D is the strongest evidence that Britain wanted to avoid war in 1914. It is supported by Source A, which looks at longer term policies. Source B also supports Source D and accurately reflects Britain’s concerns about sea power but there is no reason to interpret the extract as showing unnecessary hostility to Germany. On the other hand, Source D has little value as a comment on British policy. Whilst it represents the personal views of the Kaiser, its tone is extreme. It misrepresents the relations between Germany and Austria-Hungary, especially in 1914. Britain did not plan a war of extermination against Germany. In July 1914, Britain was not feeling triumphant at the turn of events. In Source B, Bethmann Hollweg is seen as more extreme in his reaction than Lloyd George.

The Sources that would claim that British policy was unnecessarily hostile are less reliable. Source C is the least reliable of the extracts. It shows an extreme and unreasonable reaction by the Kaiser. Although he was not fully in control of German policy because of the influence of the other military and political leaders, he was very influential. British policy is distorted, for example the reference to a wish for a war of extermination. German support for Austria-Hungary, especially in the July crisis of 1914, increased rather than diminished tensions. Austria-Hungary would probably not have taken such a strong stance against Serbia without German support and encouragement. William II’s description of Germany as being helpless against Britain’s plots is unfounded. Source B shows the reaction of Bethmann Hollweg to have been exaggerated. Its tone and his words show that he exaggerated the danger to Germany.’

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 hypothesis is that British policy was insufficiently clear. In particular, Source D does not specify what Britain would do if war broke out on the continent. The Sources can also be used to claim that Germany was unnecessarily hostile to Britain. This judgement is confirmed in Source B and especially Source D. British policy certainly became more hostile to Germany from about 1900 to 1914 but it was largely a reaction to fears of German expansionism. The Sources omit several issues that were important to British-German relations, for example Germany’s attempt to undermine Britain’s imperial position in Africa or denials of the naval race. In 1914, Belgian neutrality was crucial to Britain, probably more important than events in Serbia. The German invasion of Belgium put Britain in an impossible situation.’

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9697	01

Section B

2 Why, during the period 1789 to 1815, was Napoleon Bonaparte more successful than earlier French leaders in maintaining himself in power within France?

The key issue is Napoleon's success in maintaining himself in power within France when compared with other revolutionary leaders. The comparative nature of the question means that examiners will look for a reasonable balance between Napoleon and the other regimes for the higher marks. Perhaps 60:40 might be seen as necessary for marks of 18–25 although as always, the awarded mark will depend mostly on the overall quality of the arguments. A problem might be answers that deal only with Napoleon, with only some vague and extremely occasional mentions of other regimes. These might best fit marks up to Band 3 (maximum of 17 marks). Candidates should focus on developments within France but the effects of foreign policy will be relevant. The pressures of foreign wars helped to bring about the end of Louis XVI's monarchy whilst Napoleon's success added to his popularity and therefore his power in France. But the question does not need narratives of foreign exploits. Louis XVI's monarchy (1789–92/93) was discredited by his reluctance to accept the Declaration of Rights and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and the flight to Varennes proved a fatal error. Robespierre and the Jacobins enjoyed a brief period of power (1793–94) but their radicalism quickly alienated many. The Thermidorean Reaction produced a very difficult character of regime in the Directory. The Directors enjoyed little support among the civil population and depended increasingly on the army, including Napoleon. They failed to solve some of the basic problems of France, including the economic and financial weaknesses. They were personally unpopular and accused of corruption. Napoleon proved a strong contrast. He claimed to be the heir of the Revolution, gaining popularity among those who wished to defend the changes since 1789, but he also provided the stability that reassured more conservative groups. His domestic reforms, for example the Code, the Concordat and changes to the machinery of government, enhanced his personal position whilst giving the appearance of rule in the interests of the people. He tried to reconcile the interests of different groups; in reality, it favoured most the more influential social and economic classes.

3 Why did Britain undergo an Industrial Revolution earlier than France and Germany?

The key issue is the reasons for the different progress to industrialisation of Britain, France and Germany. The Question asks 'Why..?' and the answers in the two highest bands can be expected to be mostly analytical or explanatory. However, examiners should not undervalue answers that use description to underline explanation. Three countries are mentioned in the Question but examiners will not look for three equal parts. It will be reasonable for candidates to spend most time on Britain. Answers in Bands 1 and 2 should be able to deal with both France and Germany, but possibly not to an equal extent. Sequential answers should not be undervalued. The question is based on a comparison but some sequential answers can still make effective points of comparison. Band 5 will require an adequate understanding of one country, very probably Britain. Britain had a larger investment base than France and Germany. The middle class was relatively wealthy and some nobles were willing to invest in industry or in developments, such as railways, that were linked to industry. Until 1832, government was dominated by nobles and large landowners but, after the 1832 Reform Act governments had to give more weight to the interests of the middle classes. The British political and social structure was more stable than France and Germany. Eighteenth-century France saw the middle classes subservient to the aristocracy. Governments directed economic enterprise but with little success. After the uncertainty of the revolutionary years, Napoleon attempted to revive the economy, including industrial enterprises, with some success but the costs of the wars had severe effects. Post-Napoleonic governments were interested in industry to different extents but their instability held up progress until the Third Republic was established. Germany was not united until 1871. Before then, some states, such as Prussia, advanced industrially and the Zollverein was influential. However, progress was more limited than in Britain until after unification. Britain's island situation gave opportunities for overseas trade both imports and exports. France had long sea boundaries but did not exploit overseas trade as successfully.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9697	01

4 Assess the claim that the assistance of foreign powers was the most important reason why Italy became unified during the period from 1848 to 1871.

The key issue is the assessment of the role of foreign powers in Italian unification. Candidates can argue that other factors were more important than the assistance of foreign powers, for example the emergence of Piedmont as Italy's leading province, but the stated factor should normally be given some attention for Band 5 (11–13 marks). Among the foreign powers that played a role, the most important was France. (It can also be pointed out that France impeded steps towards the integration of Rome in 1848–49 and at the end of the specified period.) Napoleon III's support for Piedmont and Plombières (1858) proved to be a turning point although he withdrew after the battle of Solferino. Piedmont gained Lombardy, the first major step towards the unification of the peninsula. It had gained vital assistance from a powerful foreign army against Austria. It can be argued that Venetia was acquired (1866) as an indirect result of the Austro-Prussian war whilst Rome was integrated as a result of Napoleon III's defeat by Bismarck's Prussia. Britain's policy and contribution represented benevolent neutrality. Alternative explanations might include the contributions of the three great Italian leaders, Cavour, Garibaldi and Mazzini. Their aims and methods varied but, to different degrees, each was important. For example, Cavour reorganised the government and economy of Piedmont; he made the cause of Italy respectable among other powers. He arranged plebiscites in the central states. Garibaldi's march on the south and moves from Sicily to Rome added another dimension. Mazzini can be seen as the inspiration for much of the movement although his vision of a republican Italy did not come to fruition.

5 'The most important effect of the "new imperialism" on Europe was to increase tensions between governments.' How far do you agree with this claim?

The key issue is the most important effects of New Imperialism on Europe. There is not a clear distinction between causes and effects but the thrust of answers should be on the latter. For example, empire was seen as necessary to preserve a country's international status; it was also an effect. For example, Britain was seen as great partly because of its empire. Candidates can agree or disagree that the most important effect was to increase international tension. Candidates can argue that other consequences were more important, but the stated factor should normally be given some attention for Band 5 (11–13 marks). Bismarck called the Berlin Conference (1884–85) to resolve disputes in Africa, especially between Britain and Germany. Such diplomacy failed and British-German rivalry continued to be at the heart of imperialism. There were also tensions between Britain and France, for example Fashoda (1898). Imperial holdings provided military bases and manpower. Other effects that can be assessed include economic consequences although the economic gains of the new empires can be exaggerated. Some might point to a heightened awareness of other cultures, giving rise to enthusiasm for religious conversion.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9697	01

6 Assess the reasons why the Russian Revolution of October 1917 ended in victory for the Bolsheviks.

The key issue is the success of the Bolsheviks in the October Revolution of 1917. The starting point of the question is open to candidates. In explaining the October Revolution, some candidates might begin with the 1905 Revolution to explain how conditions in Romanov Russia deteriorated. This will be acceptable but will be prone to the danger that answers represent general surveys. The effects of war, growing dissatisfaction with an authoritarian government, and the personal unpopularity of court figures such as the Tsarina and Rasputin might be explained. The focus of the arguments should be on 1917 and particularly the October Revolution. Some excellent answers might deal only with the events of 1917, even only with the events of October. The February Revolution brought down Nicholas II's government and monarchy but Kerensky's government proved incapable of bringing together the disparate elements in Russia, for example the army, peasants and urban classes. The unsuccessful continuation of the war discredited his government. The position of Lenin's Bolsheviks seemed weak in the summer; Lenin was in exile in Finland, Trotsky and Kamenev were arrested. But a series of crises changed the situation, above all Kornilov's attempted coup. The Bolsheviks adopted the slogan 'All power to the Soviets'. They dominated the Military Revolutionary Council. The Winter Palace was seized and Kerensky's government crumbled. The Bolsheviks abandoned their promise of a coalition government and Lenin's party gained control. The reasons therefore might be seen as a combination of weakness by Kerensky's government, the threat of counter-revolution and the ability to Lenin to take advantage of the weakness of rival groups.

7 How far can Mussolini's rule in Italy from 1922 to 1939 be described as a 'totalitarian' regime?

The key issue is an assessment of the claim that Mussolini's government of Italy was totalitarian. Candidates should be given credit when they specifically define or explain the term 'totalitarian' but it should be possible for answers to reach Band 1 (21–25) when they do not but show a clear, if implicit, understanding of its meaning. Totalitarianism involved the control of a populace through a single party, the leadership of a single person, suppression of the opposition and an end to individual rights. It was associated with the use of force and terror to suppress dissidents. Mussolini came to power in 1922 at the head of a coalition but was a dictator by 1925. The political opposition was banned, as were trade unions. The press was controlled. Local officials were nominated by the fascists, not freely elected. The use of violence can be linked to the murder of Matteotti (1924), a leading socialist. However, Mussolini's regime did not use the extreme measures of terror that were common in Germany and Russia. For example, the Jews were not treated severely by 1939. The police were active in seeking out open dissidents but private criticism was still possible. 'How far' invites candidates to consider the limitations of totalitarianism in Italy. There should be some evidence of this in Band 1 answers. For example, candidates might contrast Mussolini's rule with the extent of terror and suppression in Germany or Russia/USSR. He had to accept the continued influence of groups such as the army, Catholic authorities (Lateran Treaties of 1929), the monarchy and powerful economic classes.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9697	01

8 How far do you agree that, up to 1939, Stalin carried out more extensive social and economic changes in Russia than the Romanov tsars?

The key issue is the comparison of social and economic changes under Stalin and the Romanovs. Many answers might be constructed sequentially. This approach is possible but might make it difficult for answers to reach Band 1 (21–25) because it might put less emphasis on the comparative element. However, a sequential answer with strong comparative points might make this Band. There should be a reasonable balance between the two periods. 60:40 either way might merit any Band. Band 5 (11–13) will require an adequate understanding of one period. To support the claim in the question, it might be argued that the suppression of the kulaks destroyed an entire social class. Economic changes, for example the Five Year Plans (1928–32, 1933–37 and 1938–42), saw an emphasis on industrial production. Heavy industry and its necessary components were the priority. A contrary case might be argued that the Romanovs were responsible for the emancipation of the serfs (Alexander II 1861). He also introduced reforms in education and local administration that were ultimately to have great effects although their immediate results were limited. In the late nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century, the reforms of Witte and Stolypin were influential. Production increased. Railways spread. Investment from abroad boomed. Stolypin reformed agriculture and introduced changes in educational provision. It can therefore be argued that the Romanovs did more to change the basis of Russian society and the economy.