

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**  
GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level

## **MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2012 series**

### **9697 HISTORY**

**9697/11**

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, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2012 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>11</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.

<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 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 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.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697	11

**SECTION A: THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR I, 1870 – 1914**

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

**‘Russian policy before World War I was peaceful.’ 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	Report from the German Ambassador to Russia to his superior.	Russia would not be neutral if Serbia was humiliated. Russia’s overall policies were peaceful. Germany believed that it was not humiliating to remind Serbia of its international obligations.	Y-The source is probably an accurate account of what Sazonov told the writer. Y-The Russo-Serbian alliance was an important factor. Y/N - Was Russia’s policy peaceful?	Y-B: The Austrian ultimatum threatened war, which Russia wished to avoid. Russia might be forced to intervene. Russia, with France, was on the defensive against Germany and Austria. N-C: Russian mobilisation was an unjustified threat to Germany. N-D: Russia was aggressive against Germany. Russian action made mediation impossible. N-E: blames Russia. Russia was ready for war. Its warlike policies were proved by its mobilisation.	Candidates can explain the effect of Austria’s ultimatum to Serbia on Russia.
B	Report from the British Ambassador to Russia to his Foreign Minister.	The Austrian ultimatum, with a short deadline, meant war. Russia believed Austria was unreasonable. Russia was backed by France. Austria might force Russia to intervene. Russia accused Austria of making excuses in order to go to war.	Y-Britain was not neutral but trying not to be engaged. The account of the diplomatic situation is quite accurate.	N-C: Russia’s preparations for war are unjustified and force Germany to take counter-measures. N-D: Russian mobilisation was crucial in heightening the tension. N-E with D: agrees about Russian mobilisation. In addition, Russia was only pretending to be engaged in peaceful diplomacy.	There is an opportunity to discuss Austria’s ultimatum and the Russian reaction. B can be expanded to show how far Russia enjoyed international support.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697	11

C	Message from the German government to the Russian government.	Russia's mobilisation was provocative and a threat to Germany.	Y-Russian mobilisation was an important factor leading to a European war. N-The source is not objective.	Y-D and E: agree about the impact of Russian mobilisation. N-A: Austria caused the crisis. N-A: Russian policy was peaceful. N-B: Russia saw Austria and Germany as threatening peace. Russia was only accepting a challenge from Austria and Germany.	The links between Russian mobilisation and Germany's reaction can be explained.
D	Telegram from the Kaiser to the Tsar.	Germany accused Russia of preparing for war on Germany's frontier. Germany, not Russia, was pursuing peace.	Y-The account of Russia's mobilisation is valid. N-The Kaiser exaggerates his efforts to secure a peace between Austria and Serbia although he hoped that Russia would keep out of the dispute.	N-A and B: contradict claim that Russia was causing trouble. Y-C: Russia is to blame - but note that C and D have very similar provenances. Y-E: In spite of early claim that Russia was partially responsible, the rest of the extract allots most responsibility to Russia. ?-A: No reference to German attempts at mediation.	The reasons why Germany considered Russia a serious military threat can be elaborated. The Kaiser's claims to be a mediator can be explored critically. The Kaiser's motives towards Russia can be examined.
E	From a post-war American history.	Russian military power had grown by 1914. Russian support for Serbia was a crucial factor in causing the war. Russia was guilty of duplicity, openly seeking a settlement but secretly making military plans.	Y-The description of the links between Serbia and Russia is accurate. N-It is one-sided and underestimates Russia's justification. N-Russia was not the only country to combine diplomacy with military planning.	Y: C and D are both critical of Russia, especially its mobilisation. N-A and B: see Russia as wholly innocent.	Relative armed strengths can be examined. The Russian army had been improved by 1914. Russian relations with Serbia can be explained.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697	11

## 1 Source-Based Question

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

These answers write generally about 1914 but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information / evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss ‘Russian policy before World War I was peaceful’ but will describe events very generally. 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, ‘*The claim that Russian policy before World War I was peaceful can be supported by using Sources A and B. Sazonov in Source A states that Russian policy was peaceful. However, Russia would not tolerate the humiliation of Serbia by Austria. Source B justifies Russian policy by stating that Austria’s ultimatum, especially the short time-span that it stipulated, was unreasonable. The responsibility for a war would lie with Austria, then Germany, not with Russia.*’

### 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, ‘*On the other hand, Sources C, D and E show that Russian policy before World War I was not peaceful. C is a warning from Germany that Russian mobilisation endangered Germany. D contrasts the Kaiser’s attempts to mediate with Russia’s preparations for war. War could only be avoided if Russia changed its policies. E attributes blame to Russia. This encouraged Serbia against Russia. Russia was also following two conflicting policies, seeking peace on the surface while preparing for war secretly.*’

### 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, ‘*The claim that Russian policy before World War I was peaceful can be proved from an evaluation of the sources. Source A is probably an accurate record of the conversation between the German Ambassador and Sazonov, the Russian Foreign Minister. It reflects accurately Russian concern that Serbia, its ally, should not be humiliated by Austria. Britain was the least committed to an alliance of the major powers and Source B is more reliable than others as an account of the diplomatic situation and of Russia’s peaceful intentions.*’

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697	11

**L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS 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 Russian policy before World War I was not peaceful. Sources A and B are contradicted by Sources C, D and E. Source C’s claim that Russian mobilisation was a crucial stage in the moves to war is valid. This point is confirmed by Source D. Although it is not highly reliable, a case can be made to show that Russia should have persevered further with mediation. E is a secondary source published after the end of the war. This does not make it necessarily reliable but the author bases his anti-Russian criticism on some reliable evidence.’

**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 Russian policy before World War I was peaceful, the stronger case is that Russia was indeed peaceful. The most convincing extract is Source B. Britain, although a member of the Triple Entente, did not regard the alliance as a binding commitment to go to war on Russia’s behalf. Buchanan’s description and analysis is sounder than the views in the other sources. In A, Sazonov is correct when he points out the wider ramifications of the Austro-Serbian crisis. Contextual knowledge shows that Russia would have tolerated some concessions by Serbia to Austria but not the humiliation or military steps referred to in A.’

**OR**

Although there is evidence in the sources both to challenge and support the claim that Russian policy before World War I was peaceful, the more convincing case is that its policies encouraged war. Sources C and D are both from Germany and have to be treated with caution but they make valid points. Contextual knowledge shows that Russia’s mobilisation referred to in both sources was the decisive step towards war. Russia miscalculated. It believed that it had to mobilise earlier than Germany because of the inefficiency of its military organisation but Germany saw it as a threat. It believed that it was encircled by the hostile alliance of Russia and France. The judgements in Source E can be supported by wider knowledge. Russian armaments had become stronger and its government was sure that Austria and Germany would back down, as they had in earlier crises. Russia widened the crisis from an affair that concerned only Austria and Serbia.’

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 Russian policy was confused. Some, like Tsar Nicholas II, favoured peace but other Russian officials and politicians welcomed the opportunity to defeat Austria. It is also possible to argue that Russia was dragged into the war by Serbia. Russia’s concerns for Serbia are shown in Source A. However, it gave too much support to Serbian terrorist groups against Austria, as shown indirectly in Source E.’

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697	11

## SECTION B

### 2 How far did Napoleon Bonaparte achieve his aims in domestic policies?

A number of possible aims might be explored, for example the extent to which Napoleon sought personal power, his attitude to the French Revolution, and the priority of domestic issues in the perspective of foreign affairs e.g. making the army more efficient. (Detailed narrative of foreign policies and events is not required.) He reorganised the administration of France, making it more effective. Most local liberties disappeared and uniformity was imposed from the centre. The breadth of his aim to achieve uniformity went beyond the narrower scope of administration to embrace the economy. The metric system, introduced during the earlier years of the revolution, was applied universally except in the most local of applications. He saw education as useful, not as beneficial for its own sake. Reforms included widening school education among boys, again on a uniform system, and an increase in universities. The Bank of France was established to support the government, not as an independent institution (as in Britain). The extent of its success depends on whether it is compared with the previous situation in France or the British model. Napoleon's aims to codify the laws and simplify the administration were achieved but this can be judged according to the wider situation, how far he was simply enhancing his personal authority. Another aim that might be considered is a wish to be popular. The Concordat with the Papacy (1801) might be seen in this context. It was useful because, while the unpopular political and socio-economic authority of the Church was not restored, most French people were still Catholic. It also allowed some freedom to non-Catholics. Napoleon did not have firm religious beliefs but the Concordat suited his purpose. The modernisation of France and the perpetuation of his personal prestige might be seen in his encouragement of science and memorial building. His overall success might be seen in his continuing popularity. He did not face serious opposition within France. However, there is no need to discuss the long-term survival of his achievements.

### 3 Why did the Industrial Revolution affect Britain before France and Germany?

The key issue is the comparison of Britain, France and Germany, particularly the reasons why Britain was industrialised first. However, answers need not give equal attention to each of the three countries. Britain was socially and economically more open to industrialisation. The French and Germans regarded industrial and associated activities less highly. There were fewer disadvantages to industrialists, with a growing regard for *laissez faire*. Capital was more available for investment. Politically, Britain was more stable. France was disturbed by revolution until the last quarter of the nineteenth century while Germany was not unified until 1871. Some candidates might refer to war which created unstable conditions. This is true to some extent. France was engaged in war almost continually from 1791 to 1815. Wars destabilised the economies of German states. However, Britain was involved in the costly wars with revolutionary France and Napoleon. The difference was that the British economy was stronger and it could bear both the costs of war and those needed for industrial development. Some states, especially Prussia, were more industrialised than others. The Zollverein provided a form of economic unity before political cohesion but Germany compared to Britain less well. Communications were an advantage to Britain. It lacked the number of rivers that France possessed but quickly moved from canals to railways. Germany and France developed their railway systems later. The availability of raw materials might be mentioned but might be misunderstood. France had as many, perhaps more, supplies of industrial raw materials than Britain. Useful materials in Germany were not as available in the early nineteenth century. Britain's advantage over France was that investment and communications made it easier to access the raw materials and distribute finished products. Candidates might refer to inventors but again with uneven success. British inventors were not more clever but were given more encouragement, especially from the investors who turned ideas into practice.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>11</b>

**4 Assess the importance of the revolutions of 1848-49 in the process which produced a united Germany by 1871.**

The question notes that candidates should consider the period from 1815 to 1871. However, the long chronological spread of the question means that very detailed accounts will not be expected. More important will be the quality of the argument, as long as the factual knowledge is appropriate. 1848-49 marked the strongest uprising of nationalist feeling since 1815. Metternich had managed to keep German nationalism under control. He was brought down by a combination of nationalists (not only by events in Germany). German princes were pressed to introduce constitutions. However, the limitations of the nationalists, complemented by the combined strength of Austria and German princes who recovered their confidence, led to ultimate failure. The Frankfurt Parliament showed the aspirations and the weakness of the nationalist revolutionaries. Yet the revolutions proved to be a turning point. They confirmed Prussia as the leading state in Germany. Bismarck learned lessons. While he opposed most of the nationalists' aspirations, he recognised the importance Austria as the most important barrier to Prussia's expansion in Germany. A crucial debate over funding for the Prussian army brought him to power and was the foundation of his success as Chief Minister. The revolutionaries had lacked military support in 1848-49. Unlike the earlier revolutionaries, Bismarck appreciated the importance of economic forces, especially the Zollverein. He had to deal with the Liberals, the inheritors of the forces that had failed in 1848-49 but which survived. Candidates can use points such as these to frame an explanation of Bismarck's success.

**5 Did European countries embark on 'New Imperialism' more for political or economic reasons? (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)**

The question offers political and economic reasons. Other factors, such as religion, can be suggested but only briefly in an introduction or conclusion to broaden the argument. Candidates are asked to draw examples from at least two countries. Answers will not automatically be given higher marks if they refer to three but it might reflect a wider understanding. Political issues included the view that empires denoted power. This was true of Britain throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. India was not part of the 'New Imperialism' but Victoria's 'promotion' to the position of Empress of India underlined the importance to Britain of imperialism generally. France regarded an empire as proof that it was still a major power and an empire replaced Europe, where it had been defeated by Prussia/Germany, as a claim to greatness. Germany came to regard an overseas empire as necessary for its standing in international politics but imperialism became more important, especially when William II took control. Hence the emphasis on strong navies. An outcome was international rivalry and areas could be seized to prevent them falling to other countries. There has been debate about economic motives, although candidates are not expected to be familiar with the historiography. Colonies were seen as useful providers of raw materials. However, some of the areas that were colonised offered no hope of raw materials, for example in parts of Africa and some of the Pacific islands. Investment, or opportunities for surplus capital, has been claimed as a motive but more investments were to non-imperialist regions and countries such as Russia and South America. Hoped-for markets often did not materialise. Different regions of the world were attractive for different reasons. Economic issues were particularly important in China where it was more difficult to gain political control.



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>11</b>

**6 Why did Nicholas II's regime survive a revolution in 1905 but not in February 1917?**

The key issue is the contrast between Nicholas II's success in surviving the 1905 revolution and his failure in 1917. Candidates might adopt either of two approaches. They might focus closely on the two revolutions and highlight the contrasts, or be more sequential but still maintaining a comparison. Either approach might be sufficient for the highest band. It can be argued that the army was a key factor. In 1905 it was loyal. The Potemkin incident was a brief crisis in the navy. The revolutionaries could offer little resistance. In 1917, the army was demoralised by military defeats and food shortages. There were widespread desertions. Defeat in the war against Japan was an element that destabilised the situation in 1905 but the consequences were not as grave as during World War I. Candidates can expand on the reasons for the unrest in the army. In 1905, the opposition was poorly organised and its aims were unclear. It was not unified in 1917 but the radical elements had common grievances, identified later by Lenin as 'Peace, Land and Bread'. In 1905, Nicholas was persuaded to offer political concessions, especially the October Manifesto. This satisfied the more moderate critics, at least for the time being. Political concessions would not work in 1917 even if Nicholas II had been prepared to offer them. He had used up the goodwill of most Russians by then because of his oblivious attitude to political reform. By February 1917, the Tsar was isolated even from most of his associates. The most successful answers will not exaggerate the role of Lenin and the Bolsheviks in the February Revolution. He did not expect it and returned to Russia after the critical events.

**7 How similar and how different were the methods that Mussolini and Hitler used to keep themselves in power to 1939?**

Answers might be organised either thematically or sequentially. The best answers will be linked and will show an awareness of differences. For example, both Hitler and Mussolini headed regimes that relied on police and arbitrary methods but Hitler's terror was more extreme than Mussolini's. Very good answers might distinguish between the racial policies of the leaders. Racialism, especially anti-Semitism, was not a marked feature of Fascist Italy until after 1939. Hitler's Germany was very racist from the beginning of his regime. Both rulers headed a one-party state but they both came to power constitutionally. They were totalitarian to the extent that they dominated the judicial system and directed cultural and social norms. However, Hitler was again more thorough here. For example, education was directed by the state. Their attitudes to the Roman Catholic Church might be compared. Propaganda was important to both men. Candidates might refer to the use of mass meetings, speeches and posters, films and public works. One of the aims of economic policy was to enhance the personal popularity of the rulers, although there were also other aims. They were more similar here. Neither carried out an economic revolution to parallel that in Stalin's Russia. It will be relevant to discuss foreign policy. Both embarked on bold policies of expansionism, largely to win personal support. But Hitler's adventurism by 1939 went further than Mussolini's. Candidates might comment on their styles of government. Hitler, intentionally or not, tended to remain aloof from his subordinates. Mussolini involved himself more but not always to the best effect.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697	11

- 8 Explain which benefited the working classes more during the nineteenth century: industrialisation or Liberalism. (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is the comparative benefits of industrialisation and Liberalism for the working classes in the nineteenth century. The best answers will be balanced and comparative. Although it would be possible to mention alternative explanations, the key issue of the working classes cannot be evaded. Sequential answers would be possible as industrialisation and Liberalism had largely different effects. The best responses might recognise the links between the two factors. For example, Liberalism was most attractive to social groups in the middle classes that benefited from industrialisation. They then advocated concessions and reforms to benefit the lower orders. In a complementary way, industrialisation created favourable conditions for Liberalism. In assessing benefits, it will be relevant to examine losses although these can only be given credit as part of a judgement about relative effects. Candidates are asked to refer to at least two countries. The mark will not depend on whether two or three are discussed although three might reflect greater understanding and knowledge. The references can be brief and still be effective. Long descriptions are not needed. Industrialisation led to an increase in the standard of living of most of the working classes by the end of the century, although the gap between them and other classes was very wide. Fewer lived close to the breadline. Food was distributed more easily. Housing conditions improved as did public sanitary conditions. Opportunities for basic education opened up. There were places of popular entertainment and leisure and better transport offered some (limited) opportunities to travel. An overlap with Liberalism is that trades unions were generally accepted in the three countries by the end of the century and were able to influence better working conditions. Another link was through the widening franchise. The working classes did not enjoy political power but they were a force that had to be taken into account by governments. Liberalism, in spite of its primary appeal to the middle classes, benefited the lower orders. Credit should be given to the essays that understand the role of Liberalism outside the narrow political aspects. It advocated freedom of speech and association, reforms of unfair laws and excessive punishments, and religious toleration. Examples of these can be drawn from any of the specified countries.