

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9769 HISTORY

9769/23

Paper 23 (European History Outlines, c. 1715–2000),
maximum raw mark 90

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 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 May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4 and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

Section 1: c. 1715.–c. 1774

1 How serious were the obstacles facing Maria Theresa in pursuing her domestic policies?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. The question requires assessment and argument rather than a descriptive approach. The focus is on domestic policies although concerns of foreign policy affected the home front. Maria Theresa could not succeed to the Imperial throne of her father, Charles VI. This made for complications as did the shared regency with her husband, Francis II, who was elected Emperor in 1745. On the death of Francis in 1765 Maria thereafter shared the regency with her son Joseph II until her death in 1780. Joseph was not easy to handle and his mother did not share his enlightened ideas which led to tensions. The structure and nature of her inheritance made for inherent difficulties and obstacles: a heterogeneous empire – Austria, Hungary, Milan, Bohemia, the Austrian Netherlands; a lack of political unity, ten main languages, provincial estates; a rebellion in Hungary on Maria Theresa's accession. Noble privileges and the retention of serfdom inhibited further reform. These obstacles limited Maria Theresa's programme of reform which may be summarised as follows: to break down the independence of the Estates; greater centralisation, a single high court for Austria and Bohemia, greater efficiency in administration and taxation; legal reform and a new criminal code; to improve the lot of the peasantry; improvement in education; to uphold religious orthodoxy whilst exercising greater royal control over the Church; industrial and commercial expansion. War and the complications of foreign policy made reform at home more difficult. The loss of Silesia to Frederick II was a serious blow to the economic development of the Habsburg lands as a whole. The exhausting impact of the Seven Years War and War of Bavarian Succession might also be noted.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here the argument might be moved on to assess how successfully obstacles were overcome and there is a case to be argued for a large measure of success being achieved.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

2 What issues were at stake in the wars involving the European powers in the period 1733–63?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Since these wars were in a real sense European, with worldwide implications also, and were to a large extent concerned with the balance of power, answers should treat Britain as part of Europe. A thematic approach will be more successful than a series of narrative accounts of the various wars. The overarching significance of this group of wars should be addressed as well as their particular importance. The following wars should be considered: the War of Polish Succession, 1733–1738; the Spanish-Portuguese War, 1735–1737; the war of Austrian Succession, 1740–1748; the Seven Years War, 1756–63. All these wars involved the great powers and the issue of the balance of power will require a particular focus. Apart from the balance of power, answers may be expected to explore the following issues. Succession and dynastic disputes: the contest between the claims of Stanislas Leszczyński and Augustus of Saxony to the throne of Poland (Polish Succession); the challenge to the Pragmatic Sanction and the succession of Maria Theresa (Austrian Succession). Expansion and consolidation of territories and frontiers; France in the Rhineland (Polish Succession); France in the Austrian Netherlands (Austrian Succession); Prussia and Silesia (Austrian Succession and Seven Years War). Russian hegemony over Poland (Polish Succession). Integrity of the Habsburg Empire (Austrian Succession). Overseas colonial expansion and economic and commercial interests: Prussia in Silesia; Britain's commercial interests in the Spanish colonies (Jenkins' Ear); Britain and France in India and America (Austrian Succession and Seven Years War). Britain's defence of Hanover (Austrian Succession and Seven Years War).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. A useful line of argument would be an assessment of the extent to which outstanding issues were resolved or exacerbated.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

3 How, and how effectively, did Frederick William I and Frederick II of Prussia seek to control the lives of their subjects?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Answers should go beyond accounts of policies to maintain a sharp focus on the theme of 'control'. There should be a good balance of coverage of the two rulers, but not necessarily an exact one. Candidates may be expected to explore the following: 'bureaucratic absolutism', the centralisation of control over the army, finance and royal domains under the General Directory (created by Frederick William); an efficient collection of revenue, largely devoted to the army; town councils replaced by officials and control of local administration by Rural Commissioners drawn from the junker class; control over land settlement and colonisation; state encouragement and supervision of industry, commerce and agriculture; state control of education with teachers recruited from discharged soldiers; the maintenance of a class structure with separate taxes, property rights and functions in the State; the retention of serfdom in almost all provinces; new legal codes; military service based on the cantonal system (introduced by Frederick William and continued by Frederick); a spy system (adopted by Frederick William and extended by Frederick); censorship.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. A sharp evaluation of 'how effectively' should be expected here. The differences between the two kings might well be pointed up, for example, Frederick II exercised more personal control over government and administration and the wars of his reign represented more serious tests of control. Candidates might point up exceptions to the policy of control, for example, religious toleration.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

4 To what extent were Peter the Great's successors able to continue his work in the period 1725–62?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. The range of the answers should cover the reigns of Catherine I (1725–27), Peter II (1727–30), Anna (1730–40), Elizabeth (1741–62), Peter III (1762). A reign by reign account is not really required, although the abilities and personalities of some of the rulers at least should be considered, and a thematic approach should work well. A balanced coverage of domestic and foreign affairs is to be expected with a focus on Russia's position as a great power alongside levels of stability and the pace of change and reform at home. After Peter I's death his immediate successors, at least, failed to maintain internal control and the influence of the guards regiments and court factions led to political instability. None of Peter's successors, with the possible exception of Elizabeth, were of his calibre and the prestige of the monarchy suffered at home and abroad. Anne appointed foreigners as ministers and generals, whereas Peter had only used them as advisers. This policy was reversed by Elizabeth who also carried out further reforms in education and the economy and embellished St Petersburg. Under Peter III, however, the court was moved back to Moscow. Meanwhile, Russia continued to play an influential part in European affairs and wars and pursued an ambitious foreign policy, although perhaps rather unevenly. Answers are likely to argue that Russia's international influence was largely a result of the size and reputation of its army as well as a long-lasting alliance with Austria and good relations with Britain. A strong influence was maintained over Poland and Russia's candidate was placed on its throne. War against the Turks was renewed but with little success. A resurgence of Sweden was prevented although it might be argued that this was as much a result of the internal state of Sweden as of Russian policy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. The argument might be sharpened by a further analysis of the extent of continuity.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

5 Discuss the accuracy of the view that the French monarchy under Louis XV was fatally undermined both by the perpetuation of class privileges and by the powers of the Parlements.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Answers should recognise two central strands to the question: that financial and fiscal weaknesses were arguably the most serious problem facing the French monarchy; that the opposition of the Parlements was closely connected with the issue of class privileges. The Crown's financial problems arose in large part out of the exemptions enjoyed by the privileged orders, although problems were made worse by expensive and major wars and inefficient fiscal administration. The privileged orders clearly had a vested interest in resisting reform of the fiscal and financial system. Also relevant to the issue of privilege is the existence of regional particularism and the continuation of venal offices. The parlements clashed with the Crown on a number of issues: over Jansenism and the Bull of Unigenitus; over taxation with the Parlement of Paris supporting the Parlements of Rennes and Rauen in resisting new taxation and the attempt to introduce the vingtieme.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. The argument will need to be carefully balanced in presenting alternatives to the proposition contained in the question and the close connections between the relevant factors contributing to the weakness of the Crown. Among the issues for discussion are the following. The problems facing the French economy held back to an important extent by the privileged class structure (which could be seen in Marxist terms); of the responsibility to be borne by the King and his ministers; the burdens of war; religious dissent including a resurgence of Huguenot resistance, Jansenism and the suppression of the Jesuits; the challenge of enlightenment ideas. In addition the idea of 'fatally undermined' could be subjected to close scrutiny and Louis XV's reign could be put into the perspective of the French Revolution.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

Section 2: c. 1774–c. 1815

6 To what extent were the attitudes and policies of Catherine the Great influenced by the ideas of the Enlightenment?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Answers will need to go beyond an account of Catherine II's policies to focus upon the extent to which they were influenced by the ideas of the Enlightenment. There should be a conscious reference to both 'attitudes' and 'policies' although they are obviously connected. A major part of the argument is clearly the issue of sincerity, although the obstacles in the way of introducing 'enlightenment policies' were very considerable. Catherine certainly corresponded with Diderot, Voltaire and Grimm and admired the Encyclopaedia, but was she concerned simply to impress the philosophers? As to policies, answers may be expected to deal with the following but to reach the higher mark bands relevant comment and analysis will be essential. The reform of the law and the legal system; the Nakaz was drawn to a large extent from Beccaria and Montesquieu. However, contemporary opinion was that legal reform was largely window dressing and the Legislative Commission of 1767 could be seen as half-hearted and unsuccessful. Attempts were made to reform the administration; the college system and local government and some of Peter's centralising methods were abandoned largely for reasons of pragmatism. St Petersburg was enhanced and there was generous patronage of the arts but motives need to be assessed. It might be argued that the main aim of economic development was to find resources and men for Russia's armies. The thinking behind the educational changes should be assessed.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Good opportunities for sharp debate are afforded. Western European ideas were established in Russia in Catherine's reign – Locke, Voltaire and Rousseau, for example – but were confined to a small cultural group. Did Catherine's policies go beyond the desire to assert her own control over government? How far was domestic reform a platform for a powerful role abroad? To what extent was 'enlightenment' subordinated to war? How accurate is Catherine's view of herself as expressed in her epitaph? ('When she came to the throne she wished to do good and strove to introduce happiness, freedom and prosperity'). How does this square with Catherine's social policies which confirmed noble privileges and left serfdom largely untouched? What is clear is that Catherine's response to the French Revolution was one of severe repression in Russia. There is clearly a balance. Catherine it might be argued, was influenced by the ideas of the Enlightenment but the sheer size of Russia, its relative backwardness compared with Western Europe, the power of the nobility, as well as her ambitions in foreign policy, prevented such ideas being implemented in any significant way.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

7 How just is the verdict that Joseph II abandoned enlightenment for despotism?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. As well as analysing and evaluating Joseph II's policies, answers should examine his credentials for claiming 'enlightenment'. Joseph had certainly read a wide range of the works of the philosophes, and had met Frederick II and discussed enlightenment ideas with him. In his mother's reign he believed that her reform of the law did not go far enough and disagreed with her religious policy. There is a good argument to be made that after 1780, when he became sole ruler, he certainly made an effort to convert theory into practice. He abolished censorship, granted full religious toleration except for atheists and Deists and nationalised the Church. Greater caution was shown in dealing with serfdom; personal dependence on lords was abolished but the robot was retained. Greater freedom for serfs on crown estates was extended to Austria and Bohemia. An attempt to abolish serfdom in Hungary led to rebellion (1789). Meanwhile, tax reform was opposed by the peasantry and had to be revoked by Joseph's successor. An attempt was made to liberate industry and commerce (following Turgot) and government regulations were relaxed. It might be relevant to deal with the attempt to 'Germanise' Hungary and the response this provoked.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. A good balanced sense of argument is expected throughout. For example, how great were the obstacles in Joseph's way? Was he in too much of a hurry (his sole reign lasted for only ten years)? He acted with great energy certainly but perhaps at too great a pace. By the end of his reign Joseph has reintroduced censorship, set up a secret police and was suppressing opposition by armed force, for example, in the Austrian Netherlands. Perhaps, in Rousseau's phrase, he was 'forcing people to be free'. How apt is the judgement that Joseph was 'the Enlightenment's aptest pupil and its most spectacular failure'?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 12	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

8 Why did Poland lose its independence in the later-eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Answers should demonstrate an awareness of the three Partitions (1772, 1793, 1795) but details are not required and a narrative account would not be an appropriate response. Candidates may be expected to discuss the weaknesses of Poland: a large and heterogeneous state with few natural frontiers; Poland and Lithuania had separate administrations; large minorities of Russians, Germans, Ukrainians and Jews; some three quarters of the population were peasants most of whom were serfs; a large and privileged nobility; an elective monarchy which gave opportunities for foreign intervention; the liberum veto in the Diet and provincial diets which made effective government difficult. Alongside this state of affairs within Poland must be set the interests and ambitions of the great Powers – Russia, Prussia and Austria. Frederick the Great was concerned to gain territory at Poland's expense (perhaps this was a long-term plan, although it was not actually proposed until 1769). Prussia's eventual gains were of great economic and strategic value. Russia wanted a subservient and peaceful Poland (a kind of satellite state) and was also concerned to uphold the interests of Orthodox Christians in a largely Catholic country. Russian intervention in Poland provoked a war with the Turks (1765). This led to the First Partition since Frederick was concerned to satisfy Russia and Austria in order to prevent their expansion in the Balkans. Austria, being thwarted in the Balkans, accepted compensation in Poland. The Second Partition arose, in large part, out of circumstances in the West and, in particular, the defeat of Austria and Prussia by France at Valmy. Prussia demanded more of Poland as the price of continuing the alliance with Austria. Russia invaded Poland on conclusion of its war with Turkey. The Second and Third Partitions may be seen as a means of preventing the rivalry of Austria, Prussia and Russia leading to a war between them and the preoccupations of France with continuing revolution and a war in the West against the central powers.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. A carefully balanced argument is required in evaluating the relative importance of Poland's weaknesses and the interests of the Great Powers (including France).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 13	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

9 Why was the constitutional monarchy of France (1789–92) so quickly overthrown?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Explanation and argument are required rather than narrative and there should be some attention to the speed of the collapse of the constitutional monarchy ('so quickly overthrown'). Answers may be expected to discuss the significance of the following. Flaws in the Constitution itself, for example, the exclusion of deputies from ministerial office. Mishandling of events and misjudgements on the part of the King and his advisers – the royal veto, non-juring priests, the emigres, the 'patriot ministry', delays in accepting the Constitution, the flight to Varennes. The divisiveness of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. Radical clubs and their role as a rival to the Assembly. The continuing radicalisation of Paris, the organisations of the Paris sections and their relationship with the clubs, violent events such as the Massacre of the Champ de Mars. The outbreak of war and the tension leading up to it, the hostility of foreign powers to the Revolution' (for example, the declaration of Pilnitz), the equivocal attitude of the King, social disorder and panic, economic and social distress exacerbated by the war (and especially in Paris). The August Revolution of 1792.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. A number of lines of discussion are open here. How far can it be argued that the Constitution was doomed from the start? What was the relative importance of the factors at work? Does the failure of the constitutional monarchy represent, above all, a breakdown of consensus?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 14	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

10 How far should Napoleon be regarded to as 'the heir to the French Revolution'?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A good, balanced coverage is required including both foreign and domestic policies (although the principal concentration may well be upon domestic) and both the Empire and the Consulate (although, again, the main focus may be upon the latter). Answers may be expected to deal with the following. The constitutions of the Consulate and Empire, elections, the franchise representation, the use of plebiscites. Law codes and education reforms which, it might be argued, not only consolidated the work of the Revolution but extended it. The revolutionary period had adopted the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and the nationalisation of Church property. These broad principles were continued by Napoleon, the clergy were paid by the State and all faiths were tolerated but, it might be argued, Napoleon's Concordat with the Papacy betrayed the spirit of the Revolution. The principles embedded in the Declaration of Rights, equality before the law, personal freedom, the abolition of feudal rights and class privileges and careers open to talent were upheld by Napoleon. However answers may point out that Napoleon crowned himself Emperor, created titles for generals and family members and instituted the Legion of Honour. Moreover, the principles of Napoleonic government were stated to be order, justice and moderation which may demonstrate a different emphasis to liberty, equality and fraternity. The structure of local government (departements and communes) was retained and extended and although the introduction of prefects has been seen as a departure from revolutionary principles. Candidates may point to the equally centralising influence of representatives on mission. Other areas of policy to be explored and compared include taxation, economic regulation and conscription. Napoleonic foreign policy, war and conquest might be seen as a defence of the frontiers achieved by the French Revolutionary wars and as a means of exporting revolutionary values and institutions. The counter-argument is that Napoleon sought personal glory.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. The phrases 'be regarded as' and 'heir to the French Revolution' provide encouragement for an exploration of the historiography and the views of contemporaries as well as or historians. Perhaps the title of 'Emperor' was a betrayal of the revolution and the formula 'Emperor of the French' was an empty fiction. It might be argued that Napoleon was the 'heir' to the Revolution in the sense that military dictatorship was the inevitable outcome or a period of revolutionary turbulence and that Napoleon was only one of a number of possible candidates as the 'man on the white horse'. Although most answers may well confine their attention to the period of the revolution 1789–92, the best answers may well look beyond this to the more radical phase and draw comparisons with this and Napoleonic France in terms of police methods and terror, propaganda, censorship, economic controls and centralisation. After all, it might be argued that Napoleon owed his career to Jacobin principles and support.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 15	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

Section 3: Themes c. 1715–c. 1815

11 How important for political activity was the influence of eighteenth-century political thought?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. This is a large subject and exhaustive treatment is not necessarily to be expected. Answers should see political thought in a European-wide context, should include British writers and thinkers and should go beyond simple descriptions of ideas. The emphasis should be on 'important' – how widespread and how powerful in guiding political action and changing attitudes. Answers can, and probably will, deal with the influence of political thinkers upon rulers but the approach must be relevant to the terms of the question and not simply an account of policies. An account of the reign of one 'enlightened despot' (Frederick II, Catherine II, Joseph II), for example, would not score highly. The influence of political thought upon political and intellectual societies in major cities and the provinces (France, for example) and upon Masonic lodges would provide a very good field of enquiry. Locke, although belonging to the seventeenth century, had a profound influence upon eighteenth-century thought. Again, coverage need not be exhaustive but the following provide some good examples: Grimm, Condorcet, d'Argenson, Diderot, Rousseau and Voltaire; Montesquieu, Beccaria and Blackstone; economic thinkers and physiocrats such as Turgot, Quesnoy and Adam Smith; Mary Wollstonecraft. The influence of political thinkers in questioning the authority of the Church is likely to be discussed as is the wider influence of the philosophes in preparation for the French Revolution and on the changes of the first phase of the Revolution. Rousseau's influence on Robespierre and the Jacobins would also be a relevant area for exploration and, perhaps, his influence on Paoli and the movement for Corsican independence. Given the importance of the American War of Independence for Europe the influence of Locke and Paine there would be relevant to the question.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here there are particularly good opportunities for an engagement with the historiography.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 16	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

12 To what extent did mercantilist principles determine the commercial and colonial policies of the European powers in the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. There should be a conscious attempt to deal with both 'commercial' and 'colonial' policies although the close connections between them should be recognised. The term 'mercantilism' embraces a wide range of different approaches, which differed from state to state, so exhaustive definitions are not required, but answers will need to demonstrate a clear understanding of the concept and provide examples of countries which pursued the policy. Mercantilist aims involved a range of economic policies in the interests of the State: to encourage a large population (including immigration whilst discouraging emigration except in the interests of the State); to create a favourable balance of trade by, for example, protecting home produced goods by tariffs and favouring native shipping by Navigation Acts; to expand colonies and to gear their economies to that of the home country; state sponsored industries and overseas trading companies; to accumulate bullion; to maintain favourable trade balances. In some states mercantilism combined economic, political and military objectives. Economic activity provided taxation which paid for navies and armies which protected and expanded trade and colonies which, in turn, produced further taxation. Candidates will need to test the extent to which mercantilist principles were pursued in practice by particular states and examples might be drawn for example, from Prussia, France, Britain and the Dutch Republic. The broad context of European economic activity will need to be understood, for example, the main patterns of international trade (with the West Indies and the Americas; the Atlantic Triangle and the slave trade; with India and the Far East; and within Europe) and the relationship between European powers and their colonies.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Candidates may question the usefulness of the term and some explanation of the historiography would be helpful in doing so. It might be argued that mercantilist ideas were very much part of contemporary thinking but not always applied in practice, whilst there were important differences between Eastern and Central Europe and Western Europe. The term has been applied to 'statebuilding' by economic and other means in relation to Prussia whilst for Britain and France the aims were more purely economic. There are doubts, then, whether mercantilism was a unified and coherent body of economic doctrine. Mercantilism had its critics in the Dutch Republic, Britain (Adam Smith) and France (the Physiocrats).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 17	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

13 How valid are the distinctions between absolutist monarchy and enlightened despotism in the eighteenth century? (Your answer should make reference to at least three rulers.)

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not score much here, unless there is substantial explanation embedded. There needs to be good analysis and evaluation, supported by a range of examples. A clear evaluation of the terms will be required and consideration given to overlaps, indeed to the idea of 'enlightened absolutism'. Examples will be needed and likely countries are France, Austria, Russia and Prussia; others are possible. Absolutist monarchy may be viewed as French in its model (Louis XIV, Versailles, etc.) while enlightened despotism can be viewed as a variation, a derivative, linked in certain important respects. Answers will need to consider the political theory and thinking involved in both concepts – the ideas and the practices – and look at the eighteenth century context, no doubt with a leaning towards the Enlightenment, philosophes and physiocrats. Qualitative definitions and explanations are likely to feature in stronger answers, backed by suitable examples. Contrasts between Britain and Continental Europe would be useful in places. The place and role of the monarch, the nature and uses of royal power, of the state, of government, the idea of reforms 'from above' ('top-down'), the ideas of seeking improvement and of benefitting the public good (set against private needs and interests), are some of the likely areas for discussion. 'Enlightened' rulers tended to allow religious toleration, certain freedoms (e.g. press), rights to hold private property; they favoured reforms and promoted the arts, sciences, education. Their beliefs in royal power were similar to absolutists – they were opposed to constitutions and checks on their powers – but they embraced at least parts of the Enlightenment. The purpose of reforms can be debated, of course: were these a part of a conscious attempt to improve society or were these designed to improve society for the ultimate benefit of the rulers themselves?

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How valid ...' sets up explanation based on a range of reasons, with a sense of relative importance but also awareness of connections. Answers will need to assess that range and the links, looking at similar or different factors and features. There is scope for debate. As set out in AO1, there is argument whether the ideas of social improvement were linked to a genuine concern for the people under the rule of enlightened despots or to a goal of ultimate benefit to the despots themselves (fiscal, military, etc.). Also, there is argument about the extent of Enlightenment influences and about the status of rulers (more absolute than enlightened, or the reverse: Catherine the Great, Joseph II, for example). And the place of enlightened despotism within the progression and application of absolute monarchy can be debated: for example, was it the last phase in the development of that form of monarchy; did monarchical power become stronger but within a framework whereby the rule of law mattered more (service to the state, the public good, a changed idea of the functions of the state, an end to divine right rule). One route might be to compare and contrast the absolute monarchy of Louis XIV and Louis XV with a range of other rulers (Frederick the Great, Catherine the Great, Joseph II, for example). A difference could be established between absolutism (authoritarian but legal) and despotism (authoritarian and arbitrary). A distinction could be made between the kind of monarchy promoted by Louis XIV (personalised, representational – the Versailles model), intolerant (the Edict of Nantes, revocation, persecution of Jansenists, etc.) and the more tolerant approach of Frederick the Great or Joseph II, linked (as above) to aspects of socio-economic reform.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

Page 18	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 19	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

14 How significant were artistic and cultural developments in the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description or possible narrative of population growth will not do much here. There needs to be good explanation. Analysis and evaluation are needed, supported by a range of suitably selected examples. A broad sense of 'artistic' and 'cultural' can be engaged – visual arts, architecture, music, theatre, literature are likely areas. A range of examples will be needed, drawn from across Europe, for a good answer here. Links with the Enlightenment, with prevailing forms of monarchy and monarchical patronage, with aristocratic patronage, with commercial dimensions, with a growth in urban public and private venues for cultural activities and displays, all can be considered. A trend towards the secularisation of the arts as well as the prevailing and developing culture of reason and feeling may also be considered. The impact of religious and educational changes and shifts could be explored; so, too, neoclassicism, Rococo features; the music of such as Gluck, Rameau, Haydn and Mozart; advances in literary forms (e.g. journals, periodicals, encyclopaedias); the roles of such as Goethe and Schiller in a nationalist context; the emergence of Romanticism as a recognisable and powerful form; the roles of Bach, Handel, Vivaldi, Scarlatti and Domenico; commercially organised concerts; the role of the arts in the 'public sphere'. Developments could be examined through individual or individualised or collective examples from across the century.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question ('How significant ...') opens up scope for argument and debate here. Significance will need good assessment. Achievements in the arts and culture may be viewed as extensive, yet not especially significant. Then again, in context and with factors conducive to a flourishing of the arts, these achievements may be viewed as significant. Patronage, public and private; the uses of the arts and culture for personal and public (state) ends; the sense of exuberance; the expressions of power; the notion of a formative educational and intellectual climate – all such themes could be used here. Religious and social contextual issues could be engaged with profit.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 20	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

15 Explain the rise in population in the eighteenth century and assess its consequences in this period.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. This is a two part question and a sound balance, although not necessarily an exactly equal coverage between the two elements will be necessary. Explanations and evaluation of 'consequences' should be confined to 'this period' (that is, up to 1815). Candidates may wish to demonstrate the scale of the population rise – and some statistics would be helpful. Taking Europe as a whole, the population rose from 118 million in 1700, to 140 million in 1750 and to 185 million in 1800. In the period 1700–70, the population of Italy rose from 11 million to 16 million; between 1715 and the revolution that of France grew from 18 to 26 million; Spain's population over the whole century increased to 11 million from 5 to 6 million. Explanations of the increase in population might include the following: a relative decline of epidemics and famine; improvements in nutrition connected with changes in agricultural techniques; better knowledge of medicine and sanitation. Among the consequences answers may explore the following: a quickening of the pace of urbanisation; a search for wider overseas markets; a spur to further agricultural reform and improvement such as drainage, irrigation, new crops, rotation and land reclamation; farming for a market expanded; possibly an encouragement for improved communications in the form of road and canals; provisions of labour for expanding industrialisation.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Historiographical debates on the causes of demographic change may well be explored. Candidates should also analyse the interconnections between cause and effect. For example, industrialisation may have encouraged earlier marriages which in turn produced more children and thus expanded the labour force to be employed in further industrial expansion.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 21	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

16 In what ways, and why, did industry experience change in the period c. 1715–c. 1815?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative or description of the Enlightenment will not gain much reward, unless there is a good level of explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required, supported by a range of suitable examples. There will need to be a clear sense of change across the period – in scale, character, range, for example. British examples will be acceptable but the bulk must be European; indeed, good answers may use British for contrasts. Industrial activity and development can be examined at several levels. Candidates could well point to the industrialisation of Britain after c. 1760 and point up the trends involved there as being very much features found in the next century in Europe. The predominance of agriculture and agrarian interests may be cited. That said, there is scope to assess industrial elements. Shifts in household manufacturing, local crafts and proto-industries may be assessed; so, too, the beginnings of more demand for industrial goods and market-orientated crafts and needs; the role of towns, guilds, regulations (especially in Central and Southern Europe), the place of monopolies (setting costs high), the power of strong landlords, the shifts and changes in capital availability, in labour, in skills, in the uses of land, all have relation here. Efficiency was important as was the role of state governments, the demands of luxury consumption and, of course, the needs of warfare. Some referencing to trade patterns and to the slow emergence of factory systems from the 1770s, requiring new regulations, could be used here as well. Commercial shifts – indeed, facets of a 'commercial revolution' – may be regarded as having importance for developments in industrial activity.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question is in two parts ('In what ways' 'and why') and both need answering, though not necessarily in equal measure. Candidates will need to examine features of industrial activity and development and may well consider negatives alongside positives – for example, what was then missing ahead of the significant industrialisation of the next century. They may place emphasis on luxury as against common consumption needs and on military (and naval) needs. Contrasts between Western and Eastern Europe would be useful to assessment. The ideas behind 'industrialisation' (urbanisation, factories, major demand levels, 'push and pull' factors, available capital, commitment to industrial activity, skills, entrepreneurship, machinery, for example) could be examined in the above context.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 22	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

Section 4: 1815–1862

17 How successful was the Congress of Vienna in achieving its aims?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events or description of features will not do much here; rather good analysis and evaluation are needed. Candidates will need to set out aims and then assess outcomes. They will need to establish criteria for success, such as the balance of power, peace, security, national interests being satisfied, curbing revolutionary forces. These will relate to perceived or actual aims. They may well discuss how far success in such areas was owed to the settlement (e.g. dealing with France; the Polish-Saxon question) or to other factors (eg domestic preoccupations, other bi-lateral agreements and alliances, military issues and fear of war). They will also need to consider perspectives – e.g. 1830, 1848, perhaps the nature of the German Confederation, Austrian dominance in Italy. Consideration is likely to be given to forces such as nationalism, liberalism, even embryonic socialism. There is plenty of material from which to draw in examples: for example, territorial provisions for Russia, Prussia, Austria, Germany, Holland, Italy; the need to create a barrier around France; the concerns over national interests and nationalism; the balance of power; the issue of legitimacy and the restoration of the status quo; the provision (or lack of) for change in the future; how the settlement was justified; links to the Quadruple Alliance and Holy Alliance, perspectives in (say) 1821, 1825, 1830; the Congress System and its future; problems in Belgium, Germany, Italy and Spain (for example).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation of the question invites argument and counter-argument around 'How successful ...' as to scope, impact, effectiveness, short- and long-term perspectives. There is debate here, not least as to how far the settlement really did settle much and how far it did lay the basis for a workable Congress System – and how long that as well as the Settlement itself lasted; to the 1820s? 1830? 1848? even later? And successful for whom? Were the aims of the Great Powers met? What of (for example) tensions? What of Russian ambitions? What of French revival? There is good scope to consider a range of aims and so a range of outcomes, short or long term in perspective.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 23	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

18 How far did the Revolutions of 1830 and 1848 in France have similar causes?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of the period 1815–48 would need much embedded explanation to score tolerably well. Good analysis and evaluation are needed. Comparative analysis and evaluation will work well here. Some consideration of the causes, long- and short-term, of the Revolutions of 1830 and 1848 would be useful; so, too, consideration of common or different factors and issues. Likely analytical themes are the political system, the monarchical system, electoral politics and the nature of the franchise, religious-clerical forces and issues, socio-economic structures and tensions with references to the Napoleonic legacy and the important Revolution of 1848. At heart is assessment of fundamental instability factors and features set against forces that made for stability; the extent of instability will need assessment. In respect of Louis XVIII (as background) and especially Charles X, reference could be made to the caution or otherwise as to absolutist tendencies and ambitions, electoral practices and politics, the attitude to representative institutions, ministers, the Charter, censorship and religion (Charter absolutism was linked to clericalism); the strength and nature of opposition (Bonapartists, republicans, constitutional monarchists for example), changing social and economic conditions. Reference can also be made to how far the Bourbons did command the loyalties of the French, socially, politically, patriotically (an imposed regime) and/or religiously. It can be argued that support was shallow. In respect of Louis Philippe, reference could be made to the growing disappointments and dissatisfaction of key groups, again electoral issues, changing and deteriorating economic conditions leading to social unrest, the role of the press (as with Charles X), law and order mistakes, growing unity of opponents, ministerial errors, the sense of crisis of the later 1840s (this might be compared with that of 1830). Good answers will compare and so establish a sense of similar or different causes.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation of the question ('How far ...') sets up argument and counter-argument here: the Revolutions need to be contextualised and discussed in the context of stability and instability factors and features. Inherent instability may be considered, or flaws in the economic and political structures exacerbated by personality flaws of the rulers; or a search for stability after the Napoleonic regime.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 24	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

19 How important was German nationalism in the unification of Germany in the period 1848–71?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events between 1848 and 1871 will not go very far here, unless there is much focused explanation. Good analysis and evaluation are required here. Candidates will need to assess and examine the nature of German nationalism in the wake of the failed 1848–49 Revolution and the subsequent Olmiitz settlement, the development of liberalism and the leadership of Prussia (including the 1859 National Association) and the influence of Bismarck (his skilful management, etc.) all set against a range of other factors. Bismarck should not dominate here, no matter his importance. The uses he made of nationalism and the concept of Prussian or North German nationalism set against true German nationalism can be considered. Propaganda, literacy, education, romantic and more practical facets of nationalism can be embraced. Other factors will include areas such as the changing position of Austria (political, economic, diplomatic, military), European diplomatic changes (c. 1858–66), the developments in Prussia (economic, commercial, military reforms), the positions of the Northern and Southern German States, the role of the Prussian elites, the wars of unification, the role and attitudes of France.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is good scope here for argument and counter-argument, an assessment of the relative importance of factors but also an awareness of connections. 'How important ...' invites argument and debate, with nationalism set against a range of other factors. There is debate here, not least as to the significance of the 1848–49 Revolutions, the Prussian-Austrian tensions and changed stances plus status after the early 1850s, the scale of German (Prussian?) nationalism, the role of Bismarck (and indeed others in Prussia), underlying economic (and social) developments, the attitudes of States (North, South), diplomatic and military developments.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 25	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

20 How far did the unification of Italy in the period 1858–70 depend on the influence of foreign powers?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not score much here unless there is good explanation linked to the question. Good analysis and evaluation are required here. Candidates will need to set external factors against a range of other, internal factors. A sense of European context will help; the position of the Great Powers, shifting opinions and attitudes, the place of France and Austria especially. External factors will include the position, attitude and aims of Napoleon III; Plombieres; the war of 1859; the position of Great Britain (Royal Navy); the isolation of Austria; attitudes in 1861–70, not least those of Napoleon III and the responses to (e.g.) Garibaldi's expeditions of 1862 and 1867, as well as the Prusso-Austrian War of 1866 and Franco-Prussian War of 1870. Internal factors can embrace areas such as the aims, roles and behaviour of King Victor Emmanuel, Cavour and Garibaldi and the Prime Ministers after 1861; the role of national sentiment (e.g. national societies, the Mazzinian vision, Garibaldi's views); the uses made of national sentiment (Garibaldi's use and abuse of it, Napoleon III's sensitivity to it, Cavour's manipulation of it, the role of plebiscites, its importance in 'making Italians'). Candidates will be aware of the arguments over the meaning, extent and apparent weaknesses of Italian nationalism (see AO2 below).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is the opportunity here for argument and counter-argument, linked to a sense of the relative importance of factors, with awareness of connections. There is scope for debate: for example, over the roles of key individuals (Mazzinian visions, Cavour pragmatism, Garibaldi verve and inspiration), over the place of nascent nationalism, over the significance of external events, interests and intervention. It can be argued that unification was driven by an agenda that mixed external interests and events and internal minority opinions favouring forms of unity (e.g. Northern only; expanded Piedmont influence; all of Italy).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 26	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

21 'Successful in the 1850s, unsuccessful in the 1860s.' Comment on this view of Napoleon III's domestic policies.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not go very far here, unless there is good explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required. A contrast is necessary, covering the two decades, and some comparative evaluation would work well here, setting up analytical themes (politics, economy, society, support and opposition, for example) and illustrating such. Candidates will be aware of the issues surrounding Napoleon III's popularity and bids for such as well as his attempts to be seen as both effective and a moderniser. The developing answer needs to be put into the context of the aftermath of 1848, the appearance and growth of opposition, socio-economic circumstances and personnel available as advisers and ministers. The modernisation arena can be considered in respect of such areas as free trade, urban renewal, changes to the banking structure, developing a constitutional political system to guarantee civil liberties, non clerical education, free institutions. There was a reform intent, though this did not necessarily embrace some important areas, such as the franchise and electoral system. These features can be related to a further, wide range of factors, from which candidates can draw their examples and assessments: examples are the very nature of the constitution of 1852 and the powers that Napoleon III had; the promotion of a sense of material prosperity, ranging across features of modernisation (above) and improvements in Paris; the sense of a peak around 1859–60 (support of a wide range of socio-economic groups and liberals); the growth of opposition (Catholics, small businessmen and traders, Republicans, legitimists, liberals opposed to autocratic powers); the move to a more liberal Empire and the (unintended) consequences of a free press, a growth of radicalism and trade unionism; the emergence of the Third Party amidst the events of 1869–70, electoral developments, plebiscites. Brief references to the impact of foreign policies (successful in the 1850s, far less so in the 1860s) would be acceptable, but must have a close link to domestic issues.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is scope for argument and counterargument, for a sense of contrast, allied to the personality of Napoleon III and his manner, methods and style of rule – for example, often ambiguous and contradictory moves can be seen. It is possible to argue that the era of the strong ruler was over, that the 'Napoleon' factor was a growing problem, that France was undergoing profound economic and social changes such that the political arena had to adjust fast. Napoleon III's successes in the 1850s need to be considered in their scope and contrasts made with the 1860s, to identify why such successes were not maintained.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 27	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

Section 5: 1862–1914

22 How well does Alexander II deserve the title of 'Tsar Liberator'?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of the events of the reign will not go very far here, unless there is good explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required. Answers will need a good and firm focus on the idea of 'Tsar Liberator', put into context and moving beyond a simple focus on the Emancipation Decrees. They will need to consider the juxtaposition of 'Tsar' and 'Liberator', with the implications for reform as well as the presence of reaction, locked into the maintenance of autocratic powers. There is good scope to assess a range of reforms, in terms of reasons, aims, influencing factors and outcomes. Likely areas are: the motivations for reform (prior ideas, influences around Alexander II, the Crimean War, ideas for modernisation); rural reforms (the Emancipation Decrees and their consequences); reforms in local government, judiciary and judicial areas, education, the army; the relative freedoms allowed (and the consequences); the reactionary moments; the tendency to back away from meaningful constitutional reforms. Some reference to the accidental encouragement of (middle-class, liberal-minded) critics and opponents would be permissible as would reference to groups such as The People's Will, Land and Liberty. Outcomes matter also – the actual impact on agriculture; the effects on education; the poor organisation in provinces; the feeling of groups that Alexander II had gone too far or not far enough.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question sets up a range of argument and counter-argument areas and there is, of course, debate here. Much has been written about and speculated over Alexander II, his personality, his intentions, the primacy of military needs or a possibly strong desire to reform, the modernisation fervour in court circles, the inherent structural problems of Russia and its size, backwardness, multi-national make-up.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 28	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

23 How successful was Bismarck's foreign policy in the period 1871–90?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will need much embedded explanation to score reasonably well. Analysis and evaluation are required. Candidates will need to set out Bismarck's aims, mindful of the legacy of his Memoirs and the arguments over Realpolitik; also, they will need to consider how far he formed his thinking in isolation or under the influence of advisers; the Court, the Kaisers. Awareness, too, of the general European context (and of something of the imperial rivalries overseas) will be required. Foremost will be his dealings with and policies towards France, Russia, Austria-Hungary and Britain. Consideration will need to be given to the alliance system and to its shifting geopolitical and socio-economic contexts. Answers could look at phases and periods or at relations with different countries, or pursue themes such as security, alliances, isolation of enemies. France will feature, not least in respect of the latter theme, but it is as likely that the tensions between Austria and Russia and the consequences for Bismarck and Germany will be a major issue here. Important dates may be examined: the aftermath of the War of 1870–71, 1875 (France, 1873, 1881 (Dreikaiserbund); 1882 (Triple Alliance); 1887 (Reinsurance Treaty).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation of the question invites argument and counter-argument, with scope for debate, there being much over Bismarckian foreign policy, its principles, standards and efficacy. It is possible to argue that Bismarck wanted consolidation of gains made (power, prestige, standing in Europe) and wanted Germany to play a full part in international diplomacy; then again, that his attempts to maintain a balance of power and try to balance Austria and Russia created more problems than they solved.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 29	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

24 'The massive tensions within Germany in the years 1890–1914 were created by the domestic policies of Wilhelm II.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative account of the domestic politics and main events of William II's reign is unlikely to get very far unless there are good explanation areas related to the needs of the question. Analysis and evaluation are required here. The Kaiser himself will feature strongly, his personality, ideas, more militant and aggressive nationalism, his choice of ministers and the extent to which he supported them, the nature of his court and unofficial advisers. But candidates will also need to consider Reichstag politics, party configurations on the Left and Right, elections, the growing strengths of the SPD (e.g. 1912). These areas need to be related to the economic context, the pace and nature of expansion, industrialisation and urbanisation, the power of industrial and agrarian lobbies, prices and wages, unions. All tied together here with the economic and political structures and contexts inter-related. Reference can be made to areas such as: the so-called 'new direction' in policy after 1890 (some brief reference to the domestic consequences of changes in foreign policy would be acceptable); the tariff debates and arguments; 'rye and steel'; Caprivi, social policies and attempts to placate workers and diminish the SPD growth; Bethmann-Hollweg and the Council of Ministers; the possible growth of social and political tensions c. 1900–14. Care needs to be exercised not to get diverted into excessive concentration on the arguments of an escape from social pressures by a decision for war in 1914.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question sets up scope for argument and counter-argument. There is plenty of debate here – over William II's personality, his actions, his irresponsibility as well as over the pace of economic and social changes set against political change (was there a lack of symmetry?). What of the power of the elites? What of the domestic effects of an aggressive nationalism? How far did the Kaiser exacerbate underlying tensions? How great were those tensions? Have they been over-estimated? Was the sense of tension created in part by the elites to further their own agendas?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 30	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

25 'Alexander III strengthened the Tsarist system; Nicholas II undermined it.' How far do you agree with this view of the period 1881–1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not do much here, unless there is good explanation embedded. Analysis and evaluation are required. Candidates will need to analyse and assess. A thematic approach would work well, drawing in material from each reign; rather than a sequential approach, a comparative scheme would be good. Likely themes would be political and constitutional, economic, social, military (wars, etc.). There is plenty here to contrast between the apparently strong and very autocratic Alexander III and the weaker Nicholas II, keen to uphold autocracy but lacking the capacity so to do. Some assessment of the state of Tsardom in 1914 would fit well here (see also AO2 below). Reference areas could be: the perceived reactionary measures of Alexander III after the assassination of his father; the controls over the press, opponents and critics, embryonic political parties; the development of the Okhrana; economic changes (agrarian, more so industrial under Witte – 'The Great Spurt') and their consequences; levels of internal unrest and violence; Russification and its consequences; Nicholas II's accession and promises to uphold autocracy; the pressures and events leading to the Revolution of 1905; the Revolution then, its failure and legacy; Duma politics; the range of parties; electoral changes; Stolypin's reforms and their impact; economic downturn and upturn; labour-industrial unrest, violence, strikes (1912–14), the power of the elites; the perceived popularity of the dynasty in 1913; the onset of War in 1914. Comparison and contrast will work well here. For example, much could be made of Alexander III's ability to uphold autocracy and repress opposition and Nicholas II's problems in both areas.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation opens up argument and counter-argument, with scope for debate. As above, the state of the Tsarist system in 1914 might be a useful perspective, seeking comparisons of 1881 and 1914, seeking possible peaks of autocratic power and control and troughs of opposition, unrest, turbulence. Did Nicholas II throwaway the advantages built up by Alexander III? Were personalities crucial here? What of inherent flaws and weaknesses? How great were levels of unrest?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 31	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

26 How far can Austria-Hungary be held responsible for bringing about a European war in 1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A simple narrative of events will not work here. Analytical and evaluative content are needed. Although Austria will figure strongly here, reference to other nations (e.g. Britain, France, Russia, Germany) is expected. Indeed, a strong linkage of Austria-Hungary and Germany is likely. Good answers are likely to compare respective roles and so responsibilities as well as consider long- and short-term causes. Causal narrative could work; clear analytical and evaluative themes will work even better. However, this is not a broad, overview question on the causes of the First World War. Knowledge of such (as of debate areas) needs to be related to the needs of the question as set. Austria-Hungary faced growing threats and challenges in the Balkans, (contrasts between 1908 and 1912–13 can be drawn here) and felt pressure from Russia; increasingly, it looked to, and was encouraged by, Germany (culminating in the 'blank cheque'); its military power needed to be deployed, no matter fears as to its efficacy. The Balkans will figure: the assassination of 1914 as a trigger or Balkan issues as a deeper, underlying cause; German interests and ambitions there, especially on Mitteleuropa and Turkey; the Russian factor in posing a possible threat to economic political expansion in the area. That can provide a link to German-Russian tensions. German overseas ambitions; Anglo-German naval, imperial and commercial rivalry; German fears of French-led encirclement; German-Austrian tier and domestic pressures – these are other elements. The role of the German elites and Kaiser will figure (1912, 1914). Beyond, reference can be made to (e.g.) the Alliance and Entente system, the arms rivalries and armed camps of Europe, the Moroccan crises (1905, 1911). The roles of Russia, France and Britain merit assessment as to positions, strategic thinking, proximity (1894, 1904, 1907) and definition of interests.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How far ...' invites debate. There is good scope here for argument and counter-argument and candidates are likely to be aware of the plentiful debate here, not least as to Austrian and German motivations, perceptions, ambitions. For example, there is an offensive line of interpretation: the deliberate encouragement of Austria and the 'blank cheque'; expansionist war aims; the concurrence of military and political personnel and thinking on a 'will to war' and the famous 1912 War Council. Then again, there is a defensive line: diplomatic hostility engendered since the 1890s; growing Russian military power; the blocking of German imperial and naval ambitions; the need to preserve Germany as a major power against other perceivedly hostile or ambivalent countries. As in AO1, candidates need to consider Russian and French motives and thinking; so, too, Britain's role, growing involvement in European diplomacy and entry in 1914. Germany is still regarded as a key player, albeit in conjunction with Austria-Hungary. But the position of Russia and strategic-political thinking there as well as military planning might well be viewed as significant – and the ever-closer ties with France could be seen as significant in turn.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 32	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

Section 6: Themes, c. 1815–1914

27 How stable was the Habsburg Empire in the period 1848–1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not do much here. Analysis and evaluation are required, supported by suitable examples. This is not a question directly about Habsburg decline, though some consideration of such would be in order. The question is bounded by the important Revolutions of 1848–49 and the onset of war in 1914. Reference will be made to such areas and issues as: the Revolutions of 1848–49, the fall of Metternich failure and consequences; the Crimean War and ensuing isolation, linked to growing nationalist challenges from Piedmont and Prussia; the War of 1866 and its consequences; Hungary and the Dual Monarchy, the Balkans and growing tensions there, nationalist aspirations; relations with the new Germany after 1871 and growing proximity; governmental problems; the court of the Emperor, imperial rule, provincialism; the problems of modernisation and industrialisation; the fears of c. 1900–14, interventionism, events leading up to Sarajevo; external pressures and forces set against internal.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How stable ...' sets up argument and counter argument; there is scope for debate. As in AO1, there is debate over the origins, causes and nature of Habsburg decline; reference to such would be in order, though care will be needed in linking this to the actual question set. Candidates can assess internal changes, either side of c. 1866–67 and the effects of Dual Monarchy, a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural Empire, a lack of real power and strength (economic, military); the arguable dependence on Germany and German influences plus objectives (was the Habsburg Empire too enmeshed in such?), the sense of a fissiparous territorial entity.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 33	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

28 In what ways, and why, did the Ottoman Empire decline in the nineteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of decline will need much good explanation to secure much reward. Analysis and evaluation are needed, to be supported by a range of suitable examples. This is not a question on the 'Eastern Question' per se and excessive coverage of such will be wide of the mark; the issues involved in that will not blend with the wider scope here, the focus being on the decline of the Ottoman Empire. There is a need for contextualisation and for awareness of attempts to revive the Empire or at least delay its decline, for example and a strong focus on internal aspects, ahead of external, is expected. Indeed, good answers will work outwards from internal problems to external reactions and responses. Reference is likely to such areas as rulership; government and administration, regional and central; the quality of advisers and pashas; the problems of resources and general economic and fiscal debilitation; revolts within the Empire, 1804–30, and their effects, linked to rising nationalism; intermittent wars between Russia and Turkey (e.g. 1828–29, later 1877–78); Egypt and Franco-British roles, interventions; Pan-slavism after 1870, Russia's role; unrest and violence in the Balkans: resolutions in Berlin (1878); Bulgarian crisis, 1885–87; greater Russian pressures late in the nineteenth century; the collapse of Turkish presence in the Balkans, 1896–1913; weakened Ottoman military power; the growing sense of a power vacuum.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. This is a two part question and both parts ('In what ways', 'why') need answering, though not equally so. The question sets up argument and explanation and candidates will consider the balance between internal and external factors and the consequences, not least in the context of Balkan, South-East European politics. A strong emphasis on internal factors and features is required, ahead of external. As stated above (AO1), excessive concentration on external facets will weaken an answer. Attempts to halt or even reverse features of decline may be viewed as important, with explanation as to why they faltered and failed.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 34	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

29 How important was imperialism to the interests of European powers in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of imperial events, activities, endeavours will not go far here; explanation would be needed. Analysis and evaluation are required, backed by suitably selected examples from across the period. British examples are acceptable, but there needs to be a good European perspective: French, Spanish, Belgian, German, for example. Importance can be assessed at several levels: overseas, in empires, in areas such as Africa and Indo-China; domestically, inside European states/economic, social, political, etc.). Colonisation, settlement, economic and commercial needs, strategic considerations, discovery, adventure, spiritual-religious (humanising, civilising) factors, political imperatives, rivalries (e.g. the Scramble for Africa), government directives, elites' ambitions, geopolitical thinking, a doctrine of imperialism – all are possible or likely factors here. The repercussions inside sponsor states may be considered: for example, emigration; popular support; jingoism; social and economic pressures; raw materials, resources, workforces. Also the effects on new (or old) imperial lands could be considered: cheap labour; mining of resources; trade needs; entrepôts; markets; strategic protection; opening up of lands and more resources.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How important ...' requires assessment, explanation, a sense of the importance of imperialism in context, there is scope for argument and counter-argument, for debate. A sense of relative importance can enter also. There has, of course, been much debate over European imperialism, linked to rivalries and the 'Scramble for Africa'; also, debates over the interactions between imperial powers and their imperial lands (some of which are set out above in AO1). There will need to be a good focus on and examination of 'interests of European powers' – what were these? were they constant? did they change? were they similar or different?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 35	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

30 How far did artistic and cultural movements reflect social changes in the nineteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description of artistic and cultural changes and features would not go very far here; there would need to be very good explanation. Analysis and evaluation are needed, linked to suitably selected examples from across the period. Candidates do need to deal with the nature of social changes a broad sense of the term could be used here: changes within hierarchies; mobility; status changes for women; more working-class groups; rising middle class, unrest, upheaval, revolution attempts; unification movements, for example; also, the effects of secularisation, scientific and technical changes. Artistic and cultural can embrace literature, painting, sculpture, music, for example, and there will be fruitful areas here in writing, poetry, books, art, romanticism (etc.), classical composers. The later nineteenth-century focus on major city-based exhibitions (Paris, Vienna, Berlin, London) could be useful to assessment here; so, too, the growth of theatres, music halls, music houses, art houses, all with an eye to popular consumption, not just elitist needs.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How far ...' opens up argument and counterargument; there is scope for debate. It can be argued that art and culture did reflect changes; or that changes led to artistic and cultural developments; or that art and culture could have helped shape changes. Romanticism, Modernism, Darwinism, naturalism, these could merit attention and assessment in terms of the social and cultural importance of such.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 36	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

31 In what different ways did industrialisation develop in the period c. 1848–1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative or (more possible) a description of industrial developments will not go very far here, unless there is good embedded explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required, supported by appropriately selected examples from across the period and a range of areas of Europe. This was a period when parts of Europe experienced an 'industrial revolution' – albeit at different levels and paces – France, areas of Germany, some of Russia, for example. Impact areas that can be considered, for example, would be: urbanisation; living and working conditions; demands of and for food supplies; effects on agriculture; food prices, relative wage levels, artisan and factory skilled and unskilled differentials; working hours; health, safety; welfare; trade unions, worker representation; attitudes of employers; possible political ramifications (socialism, social democracy, unionism, syndicalism, etc.). Different groups could be assessed in terms of effects of industrial changes. It is likely that consequences will be linked to 'In what different ways ...'; effects will follow from the pace, scale and scope of industrialisation developments. A range of examples will be required so to reflect the 'different ways' of the question.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation ('In what different ways...') sets up argument and counter-argument with good scope for debate. Here there has been much debate, not least over living standards and over regional-area differences and over differences between social groups. For example, Russia saw worsening conditions with the scale of the 'Great Spurt' and its pace (1890s onwards), while Germany was better off by the 1890s, and France stagnated, it seems. Some consideration of the nature of an 'industrial revolution' in Europe could be helpful, though the question is not on that as such. Different levels of activity and operation, different scales of growth, can be considered; so, also, consideration can be given to the make-up of industrialised economies (balanced, unbalanced, heavy industries, consumer goods, military needs).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 37	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

32 Why did women have limited success in improving their status in society in the later nineteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events or a description of gains will need much good explanation to score at least tolerably well. Analysis and evaluation are needed, supported by a range of examples from across the period and across Europe (awareness of similarities and differences between West and East would be useful). Status can be interpreted as economic and social, legal, political recognition in law, employment opportunities, status as mothers and wives, matrimonial sights (divorce issues), employment wages, educational chances, possible roles in local government, demands for franchisal recognition. Awareness of structural, technical-technological, educational developments as well as of economic changes and demands for workers, skilled or unskilled, will help assessment here. Representations of women – romantic, literary, artistic (etc.) – could be used to effect here. Contextual factors will shape the causal considerations of limited success (see below AO2).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Why ...' invites a set of reasons and sets up argument and counter-argument; there is scope for debate and indeed this has been a well-debated arena. Scale, scope, extent, character and nature of gains will need assessment. Variations, continuities, levels of changes will be in focus – and awareness of the pronounced gaps between socio-economic and political arenas will be a likely feature of good answers here. There will need to be a good focus on 'limited success' as well as the issue of status in society, its expression and character. The nature of changes and gains will need to be set against a range of contextual factors (masculinity, chauvinism, 'different spheres', political debate, suspicions and fears, stereotyping, attitudes of governments and ruling classes).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 38	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

Section 7: 1914–1945

33 Why did the League of Nations experience limited success?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of the activities of the League of Nations and of major events or a description of features and workings of the League will not go very far here unless there is a strong sense of explanation, even then analysis and evaluation are necessary. While some reference to successes in the 1920s can be made, such must be reasonably brief. The focus is on the reasons for the League's failure. A sense of 'limited success' is important here. The aims and objectives of the League, based in Geneva, founded on the Fourteen Points and the decisions of Versailles and other conferences, will need to be considered; idealism set against realism and pragmatism. A sense of the international context will be important: hopes in the 1920s, fears, even fatalism, in the 1930s. Some likely areas for consideration are: the machinery of the League; the dependence on Britain and France, on Japan and Italy (two revisionist countries); the absence of the USA; the role of the USSR late on; Germany's arrival and departure; the problems over collective security, common action, arbitration, sanctions; the lack of will-power; self-interest; the inability to stand up to aggression. Reference could be made to success areas, within the confines set out above: border disputes and wars, albeit minor, in the 1920s; mandates; health, labour, refugees. Then, more so, reference is necessary to the international climate of the 1930s, the effects of the Depression, the rise of aggressive, revisionist, ambitious dictators; the relative enfeeblement of Britain and France; events in Manchuria and Abyssinia; Hitler's actions; Stalin's machinations.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation of the question sets up both argument and counter-argument here, with some scope for debate. 'Why...' requires a range of reasons, suitably linked together. Here, it could be argued that the League had innate flaws, such that made failure likely; or that the League was blown off course by the unpredictable and massive events, actions and intentions of 1930s leaders and states; or that the League did depend on favourable conditions, there in the 1920s, absent in the 1930s; or that the absence of the USA and the machinations of Stalin's USSR were decisive.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 39	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

**34 'Lenin was able to consolidate his power because his many opponents were so divided.'
Discuss this view of the period October 1917–1924.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of the period will not go far here unless there is substantial explanation linked to the question's needs. Analysis and evaluation are required. This is not a question on the Civil War per se; the time span reaches to Lenin's death in 1924. Rather, the Civil War needs to be placed in context and linked to the consolidation of power as a theme and to the focus area of divided opponents. There is plenty of material here and reference is likely to areas such as: the nature and range of his opponents (other parties, the Whites, the Greens); Lenin's skills, drive and ruthlessness; the role of other Bolsheviks, above all Trotsky, the use of 'Red Terror'; propaganda; the marshalling of resources via elements of a command economy and the use of war Communism; the Red Army; geographical and communications strengths; the divided nature of opposition, errors, mistakes, lack of unity (etc.); patriotism versus external intervention; the development of a one-party state; the reforms of the Communist Party and government (e.g. Politburo, Orgburo, role of Commissars); a range of social changes (e.g. youth, women, education); the development of the N.E.P.; the 'Ban on Factions'; the constitutions (1918, 1922); the creation of the USSR.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question invites argument and counterargument. There is scope for debate and there has been much historical controversy here. How important was Lenin and his exceptional drive and steely resolve? Did he intend to create a dictatorship? How important was Trotsky? How important were the economic strategies pursued? Just how decisive was the Civil War? How far was Lenin lucky that his many opponents could not cohere, were disunited, had no real political programme?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 40	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

35 How is the collapse of the Weimar Republic best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will need much embedded explanation to score tolerably well. Analysis and evaluation are required here. There is plenty of material here but candidates will need to focus on the key period of c. 1929–33, the onset and effects of the Great Depression, the anti democracy trends and features, the breakdown of parliamentary-based government, the moves to presidential cabinet government, the role of the elites, intrigues. Hitler and the NSDAP will figure, but this is not a question on Hitler's rise to power; the focus lies elsewhere. While reference to events and trends since 1919 will be in order, the balance of a good answer must lie in the period as above. The Depression had major impact: Germany was vulnerable given its dependence on USA loans and various structural fault lines; it enabled the extremes of Right and Left to grow; it led to the eclipse of Conservative and Liberal middle-class parties; it led to a dependence on Article 48 to push through deflationary, austerity measures. Innate constitutional weakness (the constitution, P.R., multi-parties etc.) and the narrow base for Weimar democracy (seen as very much a creation out of defeat, a SPD-led system; disliked by the conservative elites and by Hindenburg) will come into consideration. The ways in which Hitler fed off all this, the extent of his electoral success and his attractions to the elites and their intrigues can be assessed also (as above).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question invites argument and counterargument. The formulation 'best explained ...' opens up a range of reasons, a sense of relative importance but also awareness of connections. Here, candidates can assess Hitler's role as against bigger, contextual factors. Once seen as decisive, Hitler is now viewed as rather marginal, with a greater focus on prevailing economic and political factors, the consequences of the Wall Street Crash, the attitudes of the elites, the ready recourse to emergency powers, powerful anti-democratic trends, the absence of external interest in Weimar's political decline. 'Collapse' will be worthy of definition and explanation, suggesting (as it does) something possibly precipitate.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 41	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

36 How successful were the economic and social policies of EITHER Mussolini (1922–39) OR Stalin (1928–41)?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative or description of features will not go very far here; analysis and explanation are required here. Candidates are likely to treat economic and social policies as mutually inclusive and interdependent, and that is perfectly acceptable. A sequential treatment will work but, in both cases, good analysis and evaluation are needed. There will need to be some consideration of aims and objectives, political and ideological, propaganda-led (etc.). There is plenty of scope here and some selection is likely. For Mussolini's Italy, reference could be made to ideological strands, economic and social modernisation, the effects of the consolidation of state power (corporations, the corporate state), attitudes towards the church, youth and education, women, the various 'battles' and their outcomes, quite possibly the extent of economic development and preparedness for war; the contrasts between levels of success between c. 1925 and c. 1934 and problems and failures later; again, image versus reality can be considered. For Stalin's USSR, reference may be made to the whole process of modernisation linked to political power, controls and the rule of the leader and his party; to the importance of ideology and ideas (Stalinism in action?); the policies of Collectivisation and the Five Year Plans; de-kulakisation; the scale of changes; attitudes towards the young, women, the family, religion, young and old; the development of managerial and technocrat groups; socialist realism; again, image v reality, propaganda's role and power. In some or all of the above, possible confusions over objectives, a lack of clarity, an awareness of extent and nature of changes via policies and so of success will be important.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question opens up argument and counter-argument – over character, features, scale, substance of successes or failures (see AO1 above). There is plenty of debate here, not least as to ideological imperatives, the 'primacy of politics', idealism set against pragmatism, propagandistic representations of success, superficial successes or much deeper successes (here, depending on the choice, Fascist Italy will exhibit much of this, while Stalinist Russia might well be seen as exhibiting much more, much deeper success levels). Modernisation and industrialisation and some of the tensions and problems involved in such may be engaged in stronger answers, which may pick up on contradictions (e.g. older, almost mythical rural ideas and values but urgent modern economic-military needs).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 42	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

37 'To what extent did Franco's victory in the Spanish Civil War depend upon external aid.'

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of the Civil War will not go very far here; it would need good explanation to begin to answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are needed and a thematic approach would work well – external aid, external factors, leadership, resources, strategy and tactics, for example. Much may be made of the levels, forms and value of foreign aid, but other factors need to be adduced in relative importance. A comparative structure would work well, comparing and contrasting Nationalist and Republican fortunes. Reference can be expected to factors such as: foreign intervention (German, Italian, Russian, International Brigade); Franco's leadership; Nationalist strengths (including the backing of Church and élites); geographical divisions; military strategy and tactics; resources; Republican weaknesses, divisions, tensions, disunity (not helped by Stalin's attitude and directives); regionalism and particularism.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question sets up argument and counter-argument, with the scope for debate. Just how decisive was foreign aid (etc.)? Were the Republicans weakened by deep divisions and so unlikely to succeed? How important was Franco? What of the neutrality of Britain and France? How important were ideologies and patriotism, Falangism as against Socialism and Communism?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 43	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

38 How convincing is the view that Germany had, in effect, lost the Second World War by the end of 1943?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A general account of the Second World War will not go far unless there is strong referencing to the question's needs. Comment on and evaluation of the importance of the Russo-German conflict is important, though a narrative will need good causal elements if it is to score at least tolerably well. The connections between events and developments on the Eastern Front and the general Allied thrust (e.g. Arctic convoys, US supplies) should be appreciated. It is likely that candidates will place emphasis on the priority the Eastern front had for Germany; it denied her a short war and led to attritional conflict in which Russian and Allied resources ultimately prevailed. Resource allocations and indeed comparative assessment of respective German and Russian resources should figure here. The German offensives were thwarted and Stalingrad, Kursk and indeed Leningrad were turning points; the Red Army pushed back the Germans and ties down resources and personnel, helping the Allied invasion of Northern Europe. Other factors and theatres will need mention: for example, the Battle of Britain; the Battle of the Atlantic; events in North Africa and more so Sicily and Italy, the bombing of Germany; D-Day. The might of the USSR and the USA may be seen as decisive – as was Hitler's decision to declare war on the USA.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question ('How convincing ...') sets up argument and counter-argument, with scope for debate. A sense of the relative importance of factors, but also awareness of connections, will matter here. There is considerable debate here. Was Operation Barbarossa and its failure truly decisive? Or was the failure to defeat Britain crucial? Did it provide the vital platform for the USA later and distract Hitler? Was Hitler's decision to declare war on the USA ultimately significant? Was this a war of resources, pitting two super-powers against an under-mobilised German-dominated Europe?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 44	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

Section 8: 1945–2000

39 Why was the Soviet Union able to maintain its control over Eastern Europe for so long?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events or form of description of features will not score much here, unless there is good explanation embedded. Analysis and evaluation are needed. Given the time-span, some selectivity of knowledge will be needed in illustrating themes. Stalin will figure prominently here; so, too, will Stalinism. Candidates will need to examine the extent to which his political, economic and indeed foreign policies persisted to the end of the Cold War, no matter some changes (e.g. Khrushchev's de-Stalinisation). Continuities will be to the fore here. Stalinism survived long in Eastern Europe; reference could be made to the controls put in place after 1945–48, the Warsaw Pact, Comecon; Hungary, 1956; Czechoslovakia, 1968, Poland in the 1950s; hardline Stalinist East Germany; and to features elsewhere. Periodic clampdowns, loyalism amongst most ruling élites, the power of local Communist parties, a wide range of police controls, censorship, can be linked to the effects of authoritarian police rule, the cult of personality, the stress on heavy industry and defence in command economies, centralised political and economic controls in the satellite states, hardline Cold War policies – indeed the context of the Cold War itself should be remembered, since there could be little Western encouragement to East European states, until near the end of the Cold War. It would be possible to assess the question arena from a backward-looking perspective of what ended Soviet controls but this would require a high degree of sophisticated argument.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question invites argument and counter-argument, with 'Why' setting up assessment of reasons, a sense of relative importance but also awareness of connections. Here there is scope for debate: was the Stalinist model of control decisive? How important was the lack of Western attention, action, response? How important was the weakness of at least putative opposition groups in various states? Were force and its threat ultimately the key areas here?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 45	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

40 'Dangerously unstable up to De Gaulle's Presidency; very stable thereafter.' Discuss this view of French politics in the period 1945–90.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not score much unless there is good explanation linked to the question's needs. Analysis and evaluation are required here. Candidates will assess De Gaulle's place, role and contribution in the context of prior instability and subsequent stability. However, this is not a question simply on De Gaulle. The nature, causes and extent of instability need to be addressed, in part in the context of post-1945 traumas over collaboration and resistance and the nature of the Fourth Republic: the Constitution; the power of Parliament and the negative effects of PR; coalitions, weak governments; decolonisation and its impact, above all the colonial struggle in Algeria (the O.A.S, etc.); economic uncertainty and problems in the 1950s; trade union, left-wing, socialist, radical unrest and protests; Left v Right; the crisis of 1958 and the creation of the Fifth Republic. De Gaulle's tenure, his leadership, his defeat of the O.A.S. and restoration of economic and political stability will be assessed; reference can be made to economic, demographic recovery in the 1960s, the benefits of the EEC and the prominent French role therein, rapport with Germany, an independent foreign policy, a sense of well-being and prestige (c. 1962–68), the nature of Gaullism (based on efficiency and reform), the crisis of 1968 (how deep, how severe). Thereafter stability, self-assurance, well-being, prosperity (via C.A.P., for example), a lead-role in Europe (alongside Germany) may be considered by reference to Pompidou and d'Estaing on the Right and Mitterand on the Left, the levels of G.D.P, economic and social pressures (much was uneven), the powers of trade unionism, the benefits from E.C./E.U. membership, the levels of socialism and social change.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question sets up argument and counter-argument; there is scope for debate, based around apparently inherent instability forces and factors as a result of the War, around the importance of strong personality (much debate over De Gaulle), around the restoration of economic and political systems in the 1960s. Some may see continuities even with pre-1939 France, while others see the delivery of an urgently needed stable politico-social structure, one suited to the needs of the 1960s and after.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 46	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

41 Account for the economic and political achievements of West Germany in the period 1945–90.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events or description of features will not score at all well, unless there is embedded explanation. Even then, good analysis and evaluation are required. There is plenty of scope here to assess economic recovery, growth, success and political stability, founded on an effective democratic system (the positive benefits of P.R., successful and stable coalitions). Candidates are likely to consider the growing strength and confidence of West Germany, its place at the head of the EEC (etc.) and the peak of success and power prior to the debilitating effects of reunification. Prosperity and stability will be connected; so, too, economic modernisation, leadership, dominance. Issues to be embraced will include: Allied influence; the imposition of liberal and democratic institutions, not least to avoid political extremes; a return of civilising and civilised values; Allied economic aid (Marshall Plan, new currency, trade); the Cold War; a new Right (Christian Democrats); decentralising features; the roles of such as Erhard, Adenauer, Brandt, Schmidt and Kohl; the roles of the CDU, SPD, CSU, FDP parties; the influence of the Church; the value of a pro-Western foreign policy (save the brief period of Ostpolitik); the benefits of low tax, stable currency policies; the emergence of a mass consumer market; corporate roles via big, successful companies; generally good industrial relations; economic integration via the EC and effective anti-inflation policies. The above said, good answers may question something of the spread and extent of prosperity and stability – there were disadvantaged groups, immigration became an issue, urban political terrorism was a feature of the 1970s.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question form 'Account ...' opens up assessment, evaluation, a sense of the relative importance of a range of factors but with awareness of connections. Economic and political successes are likely to be seen as interdependent. It could be argued that Western (above all, American) help, support and encouragement were decisive; or that strong, skilful, astute politicians mattered; or that the end of the aberration of the Nazi period meant a return to a civilised, democratic political culture.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 47	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

42 In what ways, and why, did Spain and Portugal experience significant changes in the period 1945–90?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative or form of description of events in both Spain and Portugal will need good levels of embedded explanation to score at least reasonably well. Analysis and evaluation are required and a sequential treatment will be far less successful than a comparative one. Candidates need to address both parts of the question, though a balance of coverage of Spain and Portugal is not essential; indeed, answers are probably more likely to focus on Spain. At heart here will be an assessment of the Franco and Salazar regimes, their features, longevity, end and the consequences of the return to democracy. Reference will be made to areas such as the repressive nature of these regimes, the economic and social repercussions, the struggles to modernise, levels of social change, the manner of the return to democracy, subsequent developments in institutions and practices, economic modernisation, foreign policies, admission to the EEC/EC/EU and roles therein.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates need to address 'In what ways', and 'why' and cover both countries in the time span given. Some selectivity will be in order. There is scope for evaluative arguments and good answers are likely to probe the nature of the dictatorships and the reasons for their end as for the subsequent developments in pace, scale and character – so drawing out contrasts here.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 48	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

43 How is the collapse of Communist rule within the USSR best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of the collapse of the USSR will need substantial inbuilt explanation to score at least modestly well. Analysis and evaluation are required. Answers will need to consider long-term as well as short-term causes of the swift, even sudden collapse. That said, the long-term (e.g. structural, economic imbalance; the costs of military spending; outmoded thinking; excessive centralisation, command economic controls and planning) should be assessed alongside the short-term, with a suitable focus on Gorbachev, his aims, the policies pursued, the outcomes. Glasnost and perestroika will feature here, in context; so, too, the shifting nature of the Communist state and USSR, of the Communist Party and of the Eastern Bloc will be addressed. Reference can be made to factors such as Gorbachev's personality, skills, objectives (to strengthen the Party and the USSR, to modernise, to create a mere balance, 'westernised economy', to win over the West in investment and the transfer of skills, etc.); the nature and pace of his reforms; the effects of openness and liberalisation; the impact of economic restructuring; the responses amongst the party élites, the heads of industry and business, the people at large; the weakening of the ties within the USSR and with the Eastern Bloc (resurgent nationalism, independence, anti-communism). Issues surrounding the pace, breadth and depth of the reforms will be prominent, including those areas that attempted the swift importation of Western business ideas and thinking, the peculiar mix of communism and capitalism, the effects of the rapid loosening of economic and political curbs and controls.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation ('best explained ') invites argument and counter-argument, with a sense of factors, their relative importance and also the connections of such. Here there is much debate and good answers may reflect elements of such. For example, were structural weaknesses such that collapse was bound to come? Was Gorbachev the key to that collapse? Did he exacerbate underlying problems or did he create new, major ones? Did he try to do too much, too fast? How important was the lack of strong Western help and support?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 49	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

Section 9: Themes c. 1914–2000

44 Why did the European overseas empires come to an end after 1945?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not go very far here. Good analysis and evaluation are required. A range of reasons will be required, set in context and drawing on examples from several European Empires (French, British, Dutch, Portuguese, Belgian). A sense of common features and factors will be advanced, albeit with awareness of differences. References to phases and timespan will be in order, but there must be good analysis and evaluation of key themes. Such will be economic and financial, strategic, political and changing global contexts (the Cold War, attitudes of USSR and especially USA). The costs of empires – military, policing, administrative, investment opportunities – can be assessed; so, too, the emergence of anti-colonial superpowers and the UN, the rise of organised opposition (e.g. in Indo-China, Indonesia), the growth of militant nationalism, domestic issues (e.g. post-war socialism, right-wing reappraisal, anti-imperial, moral pressures), unrest and violence (e.g. Algeria, Central Africa). These factors may be evaluated in terms of different levels of importance according to the imperial examples chosen. For example, often, it was impossible to defend and maintain imperial-colonial presence against powerful opposition (Indonesia, Indo-China).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Why ...' invites a range of reasons, with a sense of relative importance but also of connections. There is scope for argument and counter-argument as to factors; there is scope for debate. For example, it can be argued that colonial agitation was a decisive factor; or that the costs of empire in a post-war world were unbearable, whether to victorious or vanquished European countries; or that the pressures exerted by the USA were significant. The processes of de-colonisation may be addressed in character, scale and outcomes.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 50	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

45 In what ways, and why, did Europe move towards greater cooperation and unity after 1945?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative or indeed a description of events and features are not required; analysis and evaluation are needed here. The question is in two parts but equal treatment is not required, but both do need coverage. Features of that integration and co-operation can be adduced, starting with Benelux, the ECSC, the Treaty of Rome, the EEC/EC and proceeding on to the EU. Reference to Marshall Aid, the OEEC, the Cold War and NATO would have some relevance here. The extent of integration does need careful assessment: delayed membership of the EEC/EC; faster, fast track commercial and economic integration in some areas and industries, slower progress on fiscal and political integration. A themed approach would work well, drawing on examples selected from across the period and perhaps running up to 1986, 1992 or indeed 2000 (referencing various EU landmarks – SEA, Maastricht, Nice, for example). It is likely that answers may focus on the origins and development of the EEC/EU, but some consideration, even brief, should be given to examples such as WEU, OEEC, the Council of Europe, EFTA. The above will cover 'in what ways'. 'Why' will be covered by a range of reasons (see AO2 below). There is plenty of material here: for example, the need for cooperation in the aftermath of a violent, terrible war; French concerns over Germany; idealism; seeking a balance to US influence; a desire to liberalise trade within defined areas; a lack of faith in the U.N.; a determination to avoid future internal, inter-nation conflicts; the progression of ideas for economic and then political commonalty; perhaps (for some) the pursuit of an agenda for an united states of Europe.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There are two parts to the question ('In what ways', 'why') and both need coverage. The question sets up areas of argument as well as evaluation, set in the context of the post-War European world and mindset plus the Cold War. Candidates can discuss ideas, ideals, idealism (union, unity, united states visions, etc.) but also more practical, pragmatic factors; individuals may be seen as important; political goals may be viewed as significant as economic and diplomatic. There is some scope for the use of material from the Politics Specification, provided that such is put into its proper historical perspective.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 51	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

46 How much more significant were the gains of status in society made by women in the period since 1945, compared with those made in the period 1914–45?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative or description will not go very far here; analysis and evaluation are needed. Candidates will choose their period and draw in a range of examples as directed from at least two countries. There needs to be good analysis and evaluation of the nature, extent and character of changes – in role, status, power, influence – in the appropriate period. According to choice, issues that are likely to be engaged are: gaining the vote, in local and national elections; improving property and matrimonial rights, divorce rights, etc.; improving employment and educational opportunities; health, welfare, child-bearing issues; seeking better pay and working conditions; gaining more access to business and commercial activities; securing political offices. The pace and scale of changes and the extent of common features or differences between countries should be a feature of good, developed answers. The contexts of wars and an uncertain peace will be important to assessment of 1914–45; so, too, will be the nature of societies, Communist, Fascist, democratic. For 1945–90 the contexts of the Cold War, a divided Europe, different attitudes either side of the Iron Curtain, should be engaged in assessment. Reference could be made, for instance, to the ideological dimensions as well as ‘total war’ demands of the years 1914–45: how women were presented and represented; the levels of mobilisation in the wars, the roles in helping to win or at least prolong two major wars. For the post-war period after 1945, reference could be made to enhanced employment opportunities, relative advances in political roles and representation, business acumen and standing, leadership roles, gains in equality and rights, better health and welfare (maternity, benefits, etc.).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation invites argument and counter-argument in evaluation levels – ‘How much more significant’ needs to be addressed and assessed in content and character in the chosen period. There is scope for debate as to the extent of real, genuine changes and gains and much of value could be said about the differences between democratic and non-democratic areas and about stereotypes set against the reverse. A contrast between regimes, between either side of the ideological divides pre-1945 and post-1945, could work well.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 52	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

47 How significant were the changes in the arts and culture in Europe either in the period 1918–39 or in the period of the 1960s and 1970s?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Answers will need to deploy a range of examples, as directed, from the chosen period and 'culture' is open to a broad definition – music, art, architecture, sculpture, literature, for example. The two periods of choice reflect significant phases of change, even upheaval: 1918–39 can be set in the context of the First World War, upheaval, violence, great losses, portrayals of the War, pacifism, disturbed psychological features, ideological polarisation; the 1960s and 1970 witnessed, arguably, a different type and level of upheaval, challenges to established political and social structures and orders, profound questioning of key values, a possible revolution in tastes, fashions and outlooks. For 1918–39, reference could be made to features such as the uses of art and culture made by aggressive dictatorships, set against the place of culture in the democracies; the mix of pre-modern and modern ideas, ideals, values; the impact of such as Picasso and the challenges to conventional art forms found in such as Weimar Germany and France. For the 1960s and 1970s, the power of TV, cinema, films, modernism, Americanism (and reactions against such), pop and youth culture, the extent of a 'radical culture', the on-going influences of the Cold War and of consumerism.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question invites argument and debate for the chosen period. Culture is likely to be interpreted broadly and can be linked to social, economic and political trends, challenges, changes; cultural activity can be viewed as reflecting changes in society (and political society) or as being shaped by such changes for more directed ends. In both periods, culture can be viewed as an important element of social analysis and of analysing society.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 53	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

48 Assess the social impact of immigration on Europe after 1945.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Description or narrative will not go very far here; rather good analysis and evaluation are required. A range of examples, drawn from across the period, will be required, mindful of changing contexts and growing social, economic and political issues; an idea of the scale as well as make-up of immigrants will be helpful. The main focus will be Western Europe and France and (West) Germany are likely to feature strongly, though Spain and Italy are two other very possible example areas. Some consideration to the reasons for growth and scale of immigration would be helpful, though the question is about impact rather than reasons. Links can be made to (for example) the aftermath of the Second World War, population displacement and relocations, events in Eastern Europe under Communist rulers, decolonisation forces the development of the EEC/EC/EU and its policies towards labour, welfare, borders (etc.). Likely areas for discussion include: employment (skills, low pay, long hours, opportunities); welfare help; financial and economic (costs, effects on the labour market, on economic practices); cultural (multi-cultural societies but fears over loss of native cultural identities); political (government policies, views on the Left, Right-wing reactions); law and order (policing, crime, unrest, violence).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question ('Assess ...') invites assessment and argument as to scope, character and extent of impact, with awareness of examples, different cultures and societies, a range of responses to immigration – welcomes, encouraged, feared, even loathed. Good answers are likely to draw on this variety. There is debate here – about the circumstances, the reasons, the consequences – linked to awareness of changing cultural and political values and fast changing economic systems.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 54	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	23

49 What were the major consequences of the communications revolution on European society in the period from the 1960s to 2000?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required here, not a description of features. A broad definition of communications is likely and this is in order; a range of examples from across the period will be needed, drawn from several countries (allowing for the cross-border, geographical spread of communications' forms). It is likely that radio, television, information technology (computers, I.T., etc., e-mails), telephones and fax machines, satellite relays will feature. Good answers will need to avoid description of features and will need to offer explanation levels. Likely areas are: the effects on economic activity, wealth, poverty, creation of wealth, developing skills (etc.); the effects on political activity (image presentation, telegenic leaders, opinion formation), party systems and electioneering and election outcomes; the ability to control, shape, influence, indoctrinate thinking and behaviour; the possible role in accelerating social changes and shifts. Candidates may link this arena to big events or features – for example, the Cole War and its eventual end, regime changes, the rise and fall of political parties and governments, the increase in affluence, the generational conflicts (students, for example).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation ('what ...consequences') requires an assessment of features, effects, outcomes, all in the context of technological advances (often at a great pace) and politico-social changes. There is debate here as to characteristics and the scale of changes engendered by this revolution – indeed, what is meant by the term 'communications revolution'? How apposite are the term, the concept, the mindset involved? Links can also be made to modernisation, industrialisation, American influences, spin-offs of the Cold War.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.