

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 question paper  
for the guidance of teachers**

**9769 HISTORY**

**9769/23**

Paper 2c (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.

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

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

*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.

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

### **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.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

#### **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.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

### Section 1: c. 1715–c. 1774

#### 1 How well did Maria Theresa deal with the problems facing her as ruler of the Habsburg lands?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may give an overview of the problems. These could include the hostility of Prussia and the issue of Silesia, the need to modernise the government of Austria and her own feelings on religious questions, which were at variance with the Enlightenment. In general she is seen as a successful ruler who held out, using whatever methods she could, against her arch-enemy, Frederick the Great. She won over the Hungarians to come to her aid and she reconquered Bohemia. With the help of von Haugvitz, she carried out military and bureaucratic reforms in Austria which made the country stronger and more resilient. On religion she was less successful. She encouraged and then removed the Jesuits and she persecuted Protestants and Jews and then became more tolerant. She did much to improve education in Austria and tried to do more for the peasants.

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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that, given her inheritance, Maria Theresa managed very well in overcoming the problems and revitalising the Austrian Empire.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**2 To what extent does Frederick II of Prussia's reputation as 'the Great' depend upon his military achievements?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may give an account of Frederick's military achievements such as his major victories at Hohenfriedberg, Rossbach and Leuthen and his training of his army and his choice of competent generals. He also, like Napoleon, was ready to disregard the accepted rules of warfare if it seemed likely to bring him victory. But he had his failures as well and his invasion of Saxony in the Seven Years War was ill-judged. His other achievements lay in his emphasis on improving education, agriculture and manufacturing, the ending of serfdom and his efforts to remedy the outcome of years of war in Silesia. He also tried to bring improvements to the lives of those living in the areas he obtained from Poland. His cultural achievements were, perhaps, less than might have been expected but *Sans Souci* remains.

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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that it is hard to judge Frederick other than in military terms, because so much of his reign was spent in war and his wars had a long-lasting impact on Europe. But he gave Prussia enlightened government and the resources to fight long wars, so he was not just a clever soldier.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**3 Explain the contrast, in the period 1725–62, between Russia's problems at home and its importance abroad.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may give some account of both the problems at home and the achievements abroad, but the focus of the question is on the reasons for the contrast. The problems at home arose partly from difficulties over the succession and from powerful background figures, especially in the reigns of women. The policies of Peter the Great were developed and continued to cause opposition and dissent. There was heavy taxation. But the growth of the Russian army and navy, easily the most expensive part of the administration, made Russia a threat to Eastern Europe, of which Frederick the Great for one, was fully aware. Russia had victories in all the wars of the period and made some substantial territorial gains. Her iron and copper production went on increasing and helped to supply her forces. The withdrawal of Peter III from the advance on Berlin made a crucial difference in the 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 factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that the legacy of Peter the Great is almost enough to explain the difference. His westernisation policy had made Russia count in Europe and his successors built on this. Equally, his domestic policies were incomplete and often resented. The uncertainties about the succession were a major drawback in the promoting of internal stability.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**4 How successful was the Spanish monarchy in restoring the domestic stability and international standing of Spain during this period?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that the Spanish rulers were more successful at home than they were in restoring the reputation of Spain beyond their frontiers. In Spain the power remained in the hands of the grandees, the Church and the Inquisition, but there was some success in improving the administration along French lines and certainly in encouraging cultural life. There could still be disorder in Spain, as the 1766 riots which led to the fall of Squillace, showed. The grandees remained intent on protecting their privileges. Charles III reduced the position of the church, by expelling the Jesuits and reforming the Inquisition. He also tried to lessen the grievances of the peasants and did break the power of the Mesta. Spain's role in the wars of the period was rarely a distinguished one – failures in the Seven Years War were one cause of the riots and Spain was clearly subordinate to France and often unwise to accept a Bourbon line.

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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that there was success and domestic stability was improved after the devastation of the wars, but Spain was no longer a great power in Europe. The Empire was restricted to Parma and Piacenza and rather loose control of Spanish America and was of doubtful value economically.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**5 'Absolutism in decline.' How accurate is this judgement on the reign of Louis XV?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that the aim of the rulers of France at this time was to maintain the absolutism of Louis XIV. The risky projects of John Law served to underline the need for conservative policies and the regent Orleans, Louis himself and Cardinal Fleury all concurred. But parts of the despotism of Louis XIV were dismantled. provincial governors and Parlements regained some of their former rights and there was some revival of Jansenism. Religious discord mounted, culminating in the expulsion of the Jesuits. The real decline came with the failure to solve the financial problems and to force the exempt classes to pay direct taxes. In foreign policy hopes of reversing the losses of Louis XIV's later years were dashed. France chose the wrong allies and was defeated by the wealth and the navy of the British and so lost her incipient empire.

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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that the judgement in the question is accurate, but they could argue that the legacy from Louis XIV was not a strong one and that the decline had begun even before his death. But the chasm between court and country grew greater, even if Madame de Pompadour, one of the more intelligent persons at the French court, recognised the dangers. Looking forward, the outbreak of the Revolution could be seen as simply underlining the extent of the decline.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

## Section 2: c. 1774–1815

### 6 How successful were the foreign policies of Catherine the Great?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. There is a distinction between territorial gains brought about by two successful Turkish wars and the way that Catherine allied with Austria and Prussia to expand her lands by the partition of Poland and the less successful grand plans she entertained to inherit the role of the Byzantine Empire by reviving the Greek protectorate over Balkan Christians, something that would not have been acceptable to other countries. Through alliance with Prussia and taking advantage of the defeat of Austria she gained a virtual protectorate over Polish Courland after a disputed succession. Russian pressure secured the election of Stanislas Poniatowski to the elected throne of Poland in 1764, though the hostility of France was a feature in the first of the Turkish wars 1768–74. Russia gained sovereignty over the Zaporozhe Cossacks, the port cities of Azov and Kerch and the coastal stretch between the Bug and the Dnieper. The Crimean Khanate was proclaimed independent from the Ottoman Empire. The territorial gains were obvious successes, but it could be argued that Catherine misjudged the Russian claim to be the protector of the Christian orthodox peoples living in the Ottoman Empire, a claim which repeatedly led to conflicts during the coming century. Following a policy of developing Russia's economic interests, Catherine signed a treaty with China in 1768 (treaty of Kyachta) to increase trade. Catherine's policy was opportunistic and she made the most of Austrian support by another war against the Turks. In 1781 a secret Austro-Russian Alliance was signed, directed against the Ottoman Empire. In 1783 Russia annexed the Crimea from its Khan. In 1787–91, Russia fought another war against the Ottomans, forcing them, in 1792, to cede the Jedisan and recognise the Russian annexation of the Crimea. The orientation of Russia towards the Black Sea and the Eastern Mediterranean was a major development, successful in terms of Russian power and the potential for influence; but also a danger to Britain and Austria. The expansionist tendencies were seen in the partitions of Poland and there were attempts to use Swedish internal instability to extend territory on the Baltic. Until 1772 Sweden had been in a situation similar to that of Poland, with a strong parliament and a weak executive. Here also the Russian ambassador, by the means of bribing parliamentarians, used to influence politics – until King Gustavus III staged a coup d'état in 1772. King Gustavus III, seeing an opportunity to regain territory lost by Charles XII, declared war in 1788. The Second Swedish war lasted until 1790. However, despite a revolt by the Finnish nobility who offered the throne to Catherine in 1788, Russian forces were not strong enough to avoid a Swedish victory at the second battle of Svensksund; Finland, for the time being, remained Swedish. Faced with limited naval and military might, Catherine used foreign alliances and dissident elements to her advantage – more successfully in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Partitions of Poland, where reactionary nobles preferred Russian rule which would confirm their privileges to a new and reformed Polish state.

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. There may be a distinction between some short-term successes and long-term failures; where success depended on engaging with a powerful European state, results were less successful than in wars against much weaker states with internal divisions. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 11</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

## 7 How wisely did Joseph II rule over his various dominions?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that Joseph ruled wisely in his own view but that more generally he is seen to have made mistakes. Among his more successful, and thus presumably wiser, policies were his participation in the partition of Poland, his visits to his various territories to see things for himself, his encouragement of religious toleration, his new legal code, his social reforms and his encouragement of primary education. But his war with Prussia over the Bavarian succession was unwise. He provoked opposition in both Hungary and the Austrian Netherlands by trying to enforce a more centralised government. Candidates might feel this had much to commend it as an aim, but that Joseph went about it with a lack of wisdom. His efforts to abolish serfdom antagonised the nobles, again showing a lack of grasp of practical politics. His worst error was his war against Turkey which had the result that his final years were mired by a near collapse in his empire and an almost complete surrender to the power of the nobles.

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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that Joseph was unfortunate in that his aims were good and morally justified for the most part, but in terms of what was possible in his dominions, not always very wise.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**8 Why did the Great Powers involve themselves so closely in the affairs of Poland in this period?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that one reason was the weakness of its government, which was entirely controlled by the nobles, thus making Poland an easy target. The main reason lay in the complex relationships between Russia, Prussia and Austria. Frederick II was motivated by the need for a better understanding and peace. Austria refused to give up the area of Zips and hence Frederick put forward the idea of partition as a way of restricting the growth of his rivals. They agreed, with some reluctance from Maria Theresa but much more enthusiasm from Joseph and Kaunitz. The weakening of Poland was a worthwhile cause for Austria. Catherine was less concerned but was happy to take whatever she could. The motivation for the second partition came more from Catherine, who feared the revival of Poland and was backed by Prussia at a time when Austria was fully occupied elsewhere. Catherine was able to exploit the situation for her own advantage.

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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that Poland was vulnerable. The king, Stanislaw tried to break the noble power but his failure let in the Russians, who claimed to be restoring order. This looked like a threat to the weakened Prussia and Austria, who agreed to accept it, on the condition that they received territorial compensation. Self-interest is thus the basic explanation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 13</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

## 9 Why did Revolution break out in France in 1789?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that the Revolution had been building for a long time and distinction between long and short term causes will help to differentiate between responses. The background situation with the inequality in society, the increasingly desperate plight of the peasantry, the challenge from the philosophes, the remote and unsympathetic monarchy and the losses in war can all be explained. The more immediate causes lay in the refusal of the nobles to contemplate financial or political reform to deal with the crisis in public finance, the poor harvests and resultant problems and the calling of the Estates General.

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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that revolution was almost inevitable or they may argue that the background causes needed to be ignited by some kind of trigger before a revolution could occur.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 14</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

## 10 How is the fall of Napoleon best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may suggest that Napoleon overreached himself or that his enemies took heart and so defeated him. In the former case the invasions of the Iberian Peninsula and of Russia involved Napoleon in campaigns he found hard to win because of the resistance of the native populations. His Continental System was disliked for its economic repercussions and widely evaded as time went on. He became an increasingly arrogant despot and the benefits of French rule in Europe seemed to be few. In the latter case it was very much the continuing campaigns against France by Great Britain, which held the coalition together so that it could eventually defeat Napoleon. Britain had too much to lose, in her Empire and in her industrial expansion and her trade, to give in. She also had the resources to fight and some exceptional commanders to undertake the task. The alienation of Spain and Russia helped the British to begin to turn the tide. The position of Britain as an island that could be defended successfully against Napoleon helped as well.

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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that the longer the Napoleonic Wars lasted, the harder it was for Napoleon to win. But the Hundred Days and the close fought nature of Waterloo show that it was not a foregone conclusion.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 15</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

### Section 3: Themes c. 1715–c. 1815

#### 11 Explain the influences shaping the Rococo style in art and architecture.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Rococo (from 'rociaille' shell-work in grottos) was popular in the first half of the eighteenth century. It emerged from Baroque with elaborate and ornate decoration. It was developed in France and became popular in continental Europe. It was mainly a form of interior design with its main feature being plasterwork. The natural features such as tree branches, flowers and so on were turned into flowing patterns. The style was associated with luxury with elaborate ceilings, the use of gold leaf, ornamental fabrics, graceful furniture and mirrors. The delicacy of decoration seemed to be unsuited for everyday use and was more for show. The lighter, playful and extravagant style is particularly associated with the Regency period in France. The main innovators of the Parisian rococo were a small group of decorators, led by Simon-Philippe Poirier. Its complexity was rooted in the Baroque style but had other influences – especially orientalism. It was popular in Continental Europe, particularly in Catholic countries. Though there were impressive Rococo buildings – Sans Soucci in Potsdam, Tsarskoye Selo in Russia, Queluz in Portugal, the main thrust was probably in interior design and many Baroque buildings were transformed internally. The greater use of glass may represent technological change in the ability to make large scale unblemished glass. It declined after the 1750s when ridiculed by writers like Voltaire and when neo-classical taste and the desire to have more natural and simple style prevailed.

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. Explanations may be based on artistic or technological elements – it became possible to use mirrors; there was more interest in plaster and stucco; there was a reaction from the heaviness of high Baroque. They may be more social – the French court did not base itself so much in Versailles and as the nobility moved back to Paris, they wished to renovate their homes and the market for interior design emerged. Explanations may focus on the dominance of French aristocratic and royal tastes as a model for Europe. The princes and aristocrats of Germany wished to be seen as having the elegant taste of France. The cultural dominance of France may be the main explanation and the origins may be seen in the reign of Louis XIV. The greater frivolity of court of Louis XV; the movement away from the religious conflicts of the seventeenth century; the aristocratic dominance; the more limited wars which turned the ruling classes to cultural pursuits. In domestic terms, lighter decoration and furniture reflected an interest among the ruling elite in salon-type civilization – the lighter chairs could be moved more easily; the decorations were joyful and reflected a playful control of nature. The richer middle classes saw this type of light decoration as something to be emulated and a sign of sophistication. What is striking is the interest in the style in the Catholic Church – this may be a reflection of the links between the European ruling classes and the church hierarchy. The question does ask for explanation, but there is no set expectation about the thrust of this and it could be based on the purely artistic development; but better answers may set this in a historical context. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 16</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**12 Explain the similarities and differences between absolute monarchy and enlightened despotism.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that both absolute and enlightened monarchs believed that they exercised personal authority, even if belief in divine right was receding; whether for the benefit of themselves or their subjects could be debated. They could add that both might feel the need for administrative reform, perhaps to increase revenue. Both were patrons of the arts, although again, possibly for different reasons. Differences are likely to be more considerable. Enlightened despots tended to favour religious toleration whereas absolute rulers were mainly firmly Catholic. The enlightened codified laws, ended torture and extreme punishments, encouraged trade, agriculture and industry, acknowledged that rulers had a duty of care for their subjects, reduced oppressive tariffs and supported increased educational opportunities. Absolute rulers were less likely to follow such policies and were often militaristic. But candidates could suggest that this is too simple. Maria Theresa made reforms to resist Frederick the Great, not to be enlightened. Frederick William I of Prussia had a similar motive, to strengthen his state. Candidates could discuss how far monarchs ruled to benefit themselves or to keep their country strong or whether these motives can be disentangled.

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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may conclude that the differences are more cosmetic than real as an increase in the power of the state was the aim in both types of government and indicate that the real distinction was between states with viable representative institutions and those without such benefits.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.



<b>Page 17</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**13 How extensive was the development of industry and urbanisation in continental Europe in the eighteenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates should note that the question does not include Great Britain. They may indicate that the rate of industrial development was very variable. In Russia new methods met with little support and the steam engine was not taken up. The availability of plenty of cheap labour contributed to this. Even though factories and towns grew, Russia lagged further behind the rest of Europe. Similarly, Austria tried to keep out textile machinery to protect the domestic system and in Bohemia, the most developed industrial province, the work force in factories was small. Spain did take up new textile inventions and produced more than any other continental European country. But both Spain and Portugal suffered from the perception that industry was not for the noble classes to take up. Prussia experienced the most advance and became an industrialised state. France had the Jacquard loom. In western and northern Europe towns grew, especially in areas rich in coal or with good communications. The south and east were less advanced.

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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may find that the extent of the development depended on geographical location and on how much labour was available for factory work. They may point out that the domination of GB, although not part of the question, was such that nowhere else could really compare.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 18</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**14 Assess the contribution made by women to the cultural and intellectual life of the eighteenth century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Though women contributed indirectly to intellectual and cultural life as patrons and by establishing salons, they were also creative artists. It was harder in the visual arts than in literature. Tradition limited women as painters because they lacked access to training and markets. Few could join academies or work from life models. Rachel Ruysch was a court painter in Dusseldorf but painted mostly flowers. Rosalba Carriere was a rococo artist who did join the French academy in 1720 as did the portraitists Vigee le Brun and Adelaide Labille-Guiard. They and the more famous Angelica Kaufmann (a Swiss artist) aspired to larger scale work but were more restricted by their markets to portraits. It was easier for women to pursue literature which needed less infrastructure. Women novelists could and did become best sellers. Mme de Graffiny's *Lettres d'une Peruvienne* (1730) and Mme de Tencin (*The Siege of Calais*) are examples. Fanny Burney's *Eveline* (1778) was widely read. Women did also join the ranks of enlightenment thinkers. Mary Astell produced rationalist works. However, the main contribution was through salons which supported the philosophes. Mme de Geoffrin gave a large amount of money to support the *Encyclopedie* and her salon was a sort of head quarters for philosophical discussion. Mme de Lespinasse supported d'Alambert and helped to edit the work of Diderot. Voltaire was given a lot of help and advice by Mme du Chatelet and the Marquise de Concorde. Voltaire's wife also assisted in his work. Mme de Pompadour's salon popularised and gave weight to the ideas of the philosophes and she was influential on the King to permit the sale of the *Encyclopedie* in 1759. It was harder for women to offer philosophical and scientific writing on their own but there were women intellectuals of some influence like Hannah Moore and the historian Catherine Macaulay and there were radical thinkers like Mart Woolstonecraft and the feminists that emerged from the French Revolution like Olympe de Gouges.

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. The answer must focus on assessment rather than simply describing women's contribution. The problems facing women who wished to gain recognition in the arts were formidable. In music they were admired executants, but few produced famous and accepted works of art. Similarly in the visual arts, the need to be accepted within the art establishment and have access to appropriate training were great. The most accessible art form was literature, but even here there were problems of acceptance and publication. In philosophical life, arguably the key to eighteenth century culture, their influence tended to be indirect, if considerable. Candidates may take culture in a wider sense and look at changes in family life or attitudes to education and children. However, again, this does need to have some sort of assessment. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 19</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**15 What best explains the development of overseas colonies by European powers (excluding Britain) in the eighteenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Economic motives may well be seen to predominate. French trade quadrupled in the century, for instance and by 1789 trade outside Europe had risen from 25 to 50%. Dutch, Spanish, Portuguese and French merchants brought back key luxury items such as Pepper and spices, West Indian and Brazilian sugar and Asian coffee and tea. The slave trade provided labour for the colonists. However, trade alone did not necessarily lead to rapid colonisation – the number of French in Canada for instance did not exceed 60,000 and the largest European migration and colonisation was British settlement in America. There were markedly fewer Iberian, French and Dutch colonists. The rivalry between great powers encouraged attempts to extend political control, for instance in India where the French were active in local politics and went beyond simply establishing trading stations. The tradition of state sponsored trading companies was an element in explaining how resources were available for European expansion. The extension of European conflicts to colonial areas led to the commitment of greater resources – though in France's case, her Indian and American colonies were lost. Population growth towards the end of the century did encourage colonists – for example from Germany and to some extent Iberia. Changes in the way that the home country was governed may also have affected the nature of colonial rule. The internal reforms of Carlos III in Spain were accompanied by a greater interest in controlling and exploiting Latin America. The failures in the Seven Years war revealed the need for a colonial army and reorganization of government. In 1776 the Viceroyalty of la Plata was created and there were Intendants put in place while local self government was reduced. As population in the colonies increased, more peripheral lands were exploited and greater use of native labour made in mining. In Brazil the reforms of the Chief Minister of Portugal, Pombal, also had an impact. Rio de Janeiro benefited. Among other new measures including giving more rights to the Indians and ensuring that the crown benefited from diamond mining by having a monopoly, he moved the capital from Bahia to Rio and developed the city. Probably more significant, though, was that gold was found in 1693 in the inland region of Minas Gerais, in the southern part of the colony, which set off the first great gold rush of the American continent – opening up the interior as the prospectors went westwards, and underpinned Brazil's economy for much of the 18th century. The shift in Brazil's economy from sugar to mineral wealth was a major 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. Candidates do need to address the relative importance of different factors, both external and internal. Colonial development was influenced by external factors such as the policies of the home country, the impact of war and losses and gains of colonies, and the growing markets in Europe for colonial produce. Interest in emigration was variable and developments within the colonies – for example population growth, the greater use of slave and native labour and the exploitation of resources may be considered to be of greater significance in colonial development. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 20</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**16 Did the growth of urbanisation in Europe in the eighteenth century bring more benefits than disadvantages?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Before 1750 urban growth was concentrated on existing larger scale cities in Northern Europe and did not see the 'birth' of new towns. After c.1750 the growth of the existing larger urban centres slowed and urban growth was concentrated on smaller towns and cities which grew disproportionately. In terms of benefits, candidates could discuss the economic effects of urban growth – the need for labour and resources for building, the pull of urban markets on the surrounding countryside, the employment possibilities in towns as well as the concentration of urban labour and the dangers of recession. In social terms, the diversity of urban centres, the opportunity for social development and cultural opportunities could be discussed. Europe's eighteenth century cities saw fine classical architecture and public buildings – St Petersburg for example or Georgian Bath. They saw opera houses and theatres and pleasure gardens and parks. They also saw overcrowded tenements and 'stews'. There was a development of high culture. The link between urbanisation and the greater book production, for instance in eighteenth century Paris and the stimulus for improved transport might be identified. Against that, the problems of coping with large development and influx of population in terms of public health and infrastructure could be considered; the political dangers of oversized capitals with areas of transient population subject to food distribution problems and cyclical unemployment – the Faubourgs of Paris, for example; and the diffusion of radical ideas and literature could be seen as a disadvantage for rulers. The rise of the urban mob as a phenomenon and the growth of crime and prostitution in overcrowded urban areas could be looked at; there were also increased dangers of plague and fire.

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. For example, greater literacy, greater exposure to new ideas might be seen as a benefit, but to the authorities and to the established order this could amount to a considerable challenge. There is no set answer here as examples could be drawn from a wide variety of countries and cities. Better answers will offer a balance rather than simply lists of good and bad features. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organization 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.

<b>Page 21</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

#### Section 4: 1812–1862

### 17 To what extent did the Congress of Vienna offer only limited and short-term solutions to the problems of peacemaking?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The agenda at Vienna was dominated by the need to address key problems. First was preventing further aggression of France – now that Napoleonic France was defeated, the other powers wanted to prevent any similar French domination of Europe. Revolutionary France had been a major destabilising influence, so this was allied to the more general aim of recreating a stable conservative and monarchical Europe. The second problem was how to reach a general settlement of territorial changes which accommodated the ambitions of the victors. It implied a redrawing of the political map of Europe and resolving a number of disputed areas. Russia and Prussia disagreed with Austria and Britain over the Polish-Saxon problem. Russia had already occupied much of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. Alexander I further demanded the Prussian parts of Poland. In return, he was prepared to support the Prussian annexation of the Kingdom of Saxony. These plans were opposed by Austria and Britain, partly because it would give Russia too much share of territories and partly because it would upset the balance of power and make Russia and Prussia too powerful. The third problem was how to ensure a lasting peace in Europe. The death toll in the French wars had been high and there had been a distinct change from the cabinet wars of the eighteenth century. It was very important for the peacemakers to take a longer view. Russia received most of the former Grand Duchy of Warsaw, Finland (from Sweden) and Bessarabia (from Turkey). Prussia got two-fifths of Saxony, Westphalia and Swedish Pomerania. She acquired the Rhine provinces to strengthen the barrier against France. Austria got Lombardy, Venetia, Illyria, Dalmatia and Galicia. Moreover, she was made president of the Diet of the German Confederation. This reduced the number of independent states in central Europe and a central organisation together with a strengthened Austria and Prussia seemed to guarantee stability and deter further French incursions. To bolster her trade and empire, Britain gained mostly overseas colonies such as the Cape Colony, Ceylon, Mauritius, Malta, the Ionian Islands and Heligoland. The English naval presence in bases in the North Sea and Mediterranean was seen partly as a deterrent to France. The Italian peninsula was again divided into various kingdoms. Piedmont-Sardinia acquired Genoa to safeguard the new border against France. The Kingdom of Naples-Sicily was ruled by a Bourbon king, while the central Italian Duchies were ruled by Hapsburg princes. The Papal States went back to the Pope. France was hemmed in and the conservative order restored, Austria would be the major bulwark against possible French ambitions in Italy by its position in Lombardy and Venetia. To strengthen the Netherlands' border against France, Holland gained Belgium. In order to enforce the terms and as a sign of the solidarity of monarchy, there were various treaties signed, these included the signing of the Holy Alliance, the second Treaty of Paris, and the Quadruple Alliance. The second Treaty of Paris required France to pay an indemnity and to accept an army of occupation for not more than five years. Her boundaries were reduced to that of 1790. The great powers bound themselves to defend the Treaty for 20 years and the Congress System was to ensure regular meetings. In the short term there were measures to prevent future French aggression. These included the strengthening of French neighbours such as Prussia, the Netherlands and Piedmont, the weakening of France through the second Treaty of Paris, as well as the signing of the Quadruple Alliance. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events.

<b>Page 22</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

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. It could be said that the conflicting interests of the rival powers were largely resolved. Each of the Big Four got their share of territories and the Polish-Saxon issue was compromised. The Congress had successfully restored a 'balance of power' in Europe through territorial rearrangements and restoration of legitimate rulers. Moreover, they agreed to a 'Congress System' to discuss matters of common interest. These moves did much to give Europe a long period of peace after 1815. In the long-term the attempt to restore the monarchical world of the eighteenth century and rearrange territories regardless of the national feelings of the inhabitants may have been doomed to fail. Certainly the Treaty relied heavily on the continuing power and dominance of Austria. It did not consider much the impact of nationalism on Poland or Italy or Germany that the Napoleonic period had had. This may not have been as great as later historians thought, but the settlement did come under pressure. Also, the impact of the ideas of the French Revolution may not have been fully considered. The European people were expected to accept decisions such as the union of Belgium and Holland or the ongoing partition of Poland regardless because the great powers and their monarchs had set them down. However, the Revolution had unleashed notions of popular sovereignty and it could be argued that in the long-term these issues undermined the settlement and were insufficiently dealt with.

There will be some attempt to balance the attempts to deal with immediate problems, particularly that of guarding against another French war and the longer-term limitations. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense 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 2011	9769	2c

## 18 What best explains the fall of Louis Philippe?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. After 1830 Louis was faced with opposition deriving from an uncertain claim to the throne and a great revolutionary tradition. He was content to make strong links with the middle classes and promote an image of a 'citizen king'. He removed the royal lilies from the panels of his carriages; and the Palais Royal, like the White House at Washington, stood open to all and sundry who cared to come and shake hands with the head of the state. This image helped to gain support in Paris and to give the monarchy of the Bourbons a new image, and so leave him free to consolidate the somewhat unstable foundation of his throne and to persuade his European fellow-sovereigns to acknowledge in him not a revolutionary but a conservative force. But when once his position at home and abroad had been established, it became increasingly clear that he was eager to have personal power. When a 'party of Resistance' came into office with Casimir-Périer in March 1831, the speech from the throne proclaimed that 'France has desired that the monarchy should become national, it does not desire that it should be powerless'; and the residence of the royal family in the Tuileries symbolised the right of the king not only to reign but to rule. Republican and Socialist agitation, culminating in a series of dangerous risings, strengthened the position of the king as defender of middle-class interest; and since the middle classes constituted the *pays légal* which alone was represented in Parliament, he came to regard his position as strong, combining elements from the past – the middle class support for the Napoleonic regime, elements of revolutionary constitutionalism and traditional monarchy. Risings under Blanqui and Barbès in 1839 were suppressed. Successes in North Africa and the development of railways were counter balanced by a lack of personal presence, the resentment of conservatives and the growth of political unrest. Gradually his policy, always supported by a majority in a house of representatives elected by a corrupt and narrow franchise, became more reactionary and purely dynastic. He aimed to strengthen his position in Europe by family alliances. The fact that his daughter Louise was the consort of Leopold I, king of the Belgians, had brought good relations with the English court, which did much to cement the *entente cordiale* with Great Britain. Broken in 1840 during the affair of Mehemet Ali, the entente was patched up in 1841 by the Straits Convention and re-cemented by visits by Queen Victoria and Prince Albert in 1843 and 1845 and of Louis Philippe to Windsor in 1844, only to be wrecked by the affair of the 'Spanish marriages'. Louis Philippe had seemed to sacrifice the international position of France to dynastic interests, his attempt to re-establish it by allying himself with the reactionary monarchies against the Liberals of Switzerland finally alienated from him the French Liberal opinion on which his authority was based. When, in February 1848, Paris rose against him, he found that he was practically isolated in France. Short-term problems arose when bad harvests affected France in 1847. There was political agitation in the capital and when the government attempted to suppress the Reform banquets, it found that it had lost the support of the National Guard; the regime had come under criticism in the press and found that it had no real base of support in the face of opposition.

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. Possible explanations are the 1847 economic crisis which increased working-class discontent; the resentment among certain critics of his foreign policy; the increasingly conservative nature of the regime; the lack of any dynamism and unfavourable comparison with the Napoleonic era – perhaps brought about by the return of the Emperor's remains to Paris. The growing population in the capital and the prevalence of radical unrest. Better answers may distinguish between long-term lack of solid support and the shorter-term factors, both political and economic. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

<b>Page 24</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense 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.



<b>Page 25</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**19 Why was the attempt to create a united Italy in 1859–61 so much more successful than that of 1848–49?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Reasons for failure 1848–9 are: lack of unity of aim among the revolutionaries; the failure to engage the peasantry in a national struggle; the change of heart of the Pope; the limitations of Carlo Alberto as a leader; the power of the Austrian forces; the failure of other revolutionary movements in Europe; the lack of foreign support; the predominance of regionalism and the relatively limited educated middle class who were the proponents of a revived Italy. By 1859 many of these conditions still existed, but what had changed was: the emergence of a more economically advanced Piedmont; a leader, Cavour, with clear expansionist goals that did not encompass the whole of Italy; the alliance with France, partly as a result of Piedmont's participation in the Crimean War, partly as a result of the personality and aims of Napoleon III; the willingness of Europe to accept a more united Italy now that change was not part of a general revolutionary movement but was led by statesmen and not people; the weakness of Austria on the battlefields of Magenta and Solferino. The new North Italian state would have been practicable with fewer regional, social and economic differences than the larger Italy to which the 1848 revolutionaries aspired. The actual state which emerged in 1861 can be explained by more successful heroic and popular enterprise by Garibaldi than was possible in 1848 because the weaker kingdom of Naples was the focus rather than Rome. Foreign support, particularly that of Britain, was given, unlike 1848, and the popular movement followed a successful development in the North, rather than being part of a series of unsuccessful enterprises as in 1848. By 1861 Austria was in no position to interfere and all France could do was to protect Rome.

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. Better answers may grasp that not all of the reasons for failure in 1848 had gone by 1859–61 but there were key differences both in Italy itself and in the general European context. There may be some discrimination in isolating key elements of change and the role of leadership and foreign intervention may be examined closely. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 26</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**20 Assess the view that Bismarck's contribution to German Unification has been exaggerated.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Traditionally, Bismarck has been seen as the key. He was able to build up the Prussian army by breaking resistance to spending by the Landtag. He gained Russian support from 1863; he used the Schleswig-Holstein dispute to involve Austria into a joint war with Denmark in 1864 which undercut the Bund, and then used a dispute over the administration of the Duchies to provoke a war with Austria which created a north German state outside Austrian control. A major change was made without the intervention of the other European powers and Bismarck kept France isolated. Another war was engineered in 1870 which brought South Germany into a new Reich without the intervention of any other European power. This view has been challenged by considering other factors – without the technical and organisational developments of the army Bismarck would have failed; without the economic development of Prussia, there could have been no such military development and Austria could not have been challenged; without the Zollverein and the development of nationalist sentiment, there could have been no concept of a united Germany under Prussian leadership for Bismarck to exploit; without massive diplomatic changes, Austria and then France could not have been isolated. The extent of Bismarck's manipulation of events has been challenged and many have seen a more pragmatic and less certain responding to events, perhaps with what Pflanze called 'a strategy of alternatives', with external factors and developments being more important than the view of Bismarck as a 'master planner'.

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. The key judgement is whether Unification came about mainly because of the diplomatic skills of a master planner or whether the conditions favoured Prussian expansion and that economic growth and national feeling would in any case have produced a more united Germany. The point may well be that the actual form Unification took in 1871 was the result of Bismarck's work, but unification generally, in the sense of a willingness of Germans to accept unity, even at the price of greater Prussian power, and the willingness of other countries to see a major change in central Europe may be more the result of underlying factors. However, no set answer is required. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense 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.

<b>Page 27</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

## 21 How successful was the foreign policy of Napoleon III?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The main aims of Napoleon III's policies were to dismantle the existing anti-French restrictions of the Congress system, restore the status of France as a major international power, gain foreign acceptance for his regime, promote French interests and promote the ideals of nationalism and liberalism without alienating the Catholics in France. Napoleon's involvement in the Crimean War may have pleased catholic opinion and the war ended with a victory, but the conflict is usually seen as costly and pointless. The alliance with Britain did not last. The alliance with Piedmont and the war against Austria in 1859 showed the Emperor's commitment to nationalism but again the battles were costly and Napoleon withdrew before the final outcome of a united Italy had emerged. There was some inconsistency in defending the Pope and French troops could not prevent Italy taking advantage of the 1870 war to take Rome. The promotion of a French-backed Habsburg Emperor in Mexico in 1862 seemed to be a failed adventure. Napoleon also failed to prevent the crushing of the Polish revolt in 1863 by Russia with Prussian support. However key to his foreign policy was his attitude to the growth of Prussia. He failed to do anything to prevent the defeat of Denmark and then was neutralised by Bismarck and did not intervene in the Austro-Prussian war, not expecting such a rapid Prussian victory. In any case Russia was not an ally he could count on and Britain had no wish to revive a French alliance after a period of poor relations and a virtual arms race. Left without allies, Napoleon was in a weak position to demand compensation for Prussian gains. He found himself out manoeuvred by Bismarck in the Luxembourg crisis, but there was the prospect of a catholic alliance with the South German states. The French were seen as the major military power, but in fact Napoleon had not kept up with German organizational developments. Napoleon rightly saw the Hohenzollern candidature as unacceptable, but allowed himself to be pressured by his own foreign minister and French public opinion into an unwise reaction to the events of the Ems Telegram in 1870. With a foreign policy built too much on instant successes and prestige, Napoleon allowed himself to be drawn into an unwinnable war, as South Germany rallied to the Prussian side and French forces could not match Moltke's logistical skills and the power of the Krupp artillery. Poor judgement in appointing leaders led to defeat and humiliating capture at Sedan. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events.

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. From the perspective of 1870 the foreign policies seem a failure; yet from the perspective of 1848 they seem to have achieved some of their aims and had Napoleon not overreacted in 1870 the gains in prestige and influence might have outweighed the misjudgements. Better answers will be more than a list of failures and will consider some success criteria and be aware of aims. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 28</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

### Section 5: 1862–1914

#### 22 How valid is the judgement that the reforms of Alexander II caused more problems than they solved?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates should consider the agrarian reforms and the emancipation of the serfs; the creation of local councils, Zemstva; the legal and education reforms and the modernization of the armed forces as a basis. The reforms were not a luxury but a necessity given the poor performance of Russia in the Crimean War and the unsustainability of the repressive regime established by Nicholas I in the face of growing discontent and change. However, the willingness of the Tsar and his government to modernise had limits given the continuing belief in autocracy and the social and economic development of Russia. The reforms had major limitations which meant that some issues were addressed, but the implications of change were not fully grasped. Serfdom was ended and personal freedom was a major step forward; however, redemption payments and a land redistribution which often led the peasants with poorer land than before led to considerable rural agitation in the short-term and provided a breeding ground for radical peasant parties in the future. The peasants were not made into full citizens and still suffered legal discrimination. Reforms in the legal system, greater freedom of expression and educational change were important steps, but they created expectations of greater change and the development of opposition. If some freedom of thought and expression were allowed, then what would the limits be? The Tsar drew back from a truly liberal state and opposition was met with repression again. The promise of change created problems for an autocratic state. The attempt to offer limited local self-government did meet some demands and the Zemstva were important agents of local improvement and reform. However, it raised the question of why there was no national representative body. The Zemstva provided experience for those with political aspirations and became a source of problems for the regime in due course. The military modernization put Russia on more of a par with other European countries, but had limited effects in the conflicts in the Balkans and against Japan. It committed the regime to considerable military expenditure in maintaining the armed forces.

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. It is easy to criticise the Tsar for inconsistency and failure to go far enough, thereby creating problems. He fell victim to the radicalism which he may have helped to encourage; but maintaining the repression and inability to change of the previous regime was not a realistic option after 1856 and better answers will attempt a balanced view. Had his successors developed his reforms instead of backtracking then the outcome might have been very different. A freer society was a prerequisite for the industrial development of the later tsarist period; without administrative and military change Russia would not have maintained her status as a great power – for good or ill. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 29</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**23 'Bismarck created a Liberal Germany in 1871 and then destroyed Liberalism'. How justified is this view?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The new Germany was liberal in the sense that it had a constitution; that it accepted the rights of the states in a federal structure; that it had voting; that it had free trade policies and a leader who was supported by a National Liberal party; that it promoted national unity which had been a liberal cause. It was not liberal in the sense that it had been created by military power; that the Princes had a great deal of influence; that its lower house had limited control over the key area of federal expenditure – the military budget; that the imperial government was appointed by the Emperor and not dependent on elections; that the Chancellor could not be voted out by the parliament; Prussia dominated the new constitution; the Prussian king was declared by the princes the new Emperor, not the people. In the last resort the Prussian army could have overthrown the constitution and the Prussian state ruled over Germany by force. Also universal male suffrage was not a liberal concept and was thought to be reactionary in intent. After 1871 Bismarck could be said to have subverted liberalism by ending his alliance with the National Liberals, by supporting economic protectionism in the interests of the large landowners; by repressing opposition; by an alliance with Austria; by Prussian values and administration dominating national life; by popular appeals over the head of parliament; by the failure of the Reichstag to develop any effective control of the federal government. On the other hand, the management rather than the suppression of parliament remained Bismarck's aim; the campaign against the Catholic Church was in line with current liberal thinking and hostility to what was seen as papal obscurantism; the enemies of the state – socialists – were also the enemies of liberalism. The federal structure allowed individual states to pursue liberal policies and was not eroded; the press was free to be critical; large parties developed despite attempts to repress them that were openly hostile to Bismarck. The idea that he put Germany on a 'special path' which ended in the Third Reich can be challenged; but the notion that the Bismarckian state was fully liberal is clearly doubtful.

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. 'Liberal' can be used in more than one sense. With its repression, its heavy militarism, its petty persecutions of enemies and its Imperial pomp, the Reich was not very 'liberal' in a modern sense. But nineteenth-century Liberals had an agenda that Bismarck responded to in opposing Catholic authoritarianism, in promoting national unity and economic opportunity and in maintaining parliamentary institutions and rule of law as opposed to nineteenth-century absolutism. Much depends on how liberalism is seen. Better answers will attempt a balanced judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 2011	9769	2c

## 24 Assess the view that Italy was united in name only in the period 1871–1914.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Italy emerged in 1861 with a common monarchy, a national army, a constitution. It had areas outside national control – Rome until 1870 and *Italia Irredenta* – the Italian speaking areas still under Austrian control until 1919, areas with Italian inhabitants such as Nice and Savoy and parts of Dalmatia were not in the new state, so in some senses Italy was not united. However the main argument is that rather than a truly united Italy, there was the domination of Piedmont. The so called Brigand Wars of the 1860s reflected the resentments felt in the *Mezzogiorno* and large areas of the south were under nominal Italian control with the authorities seen as alien occupiers rather than fellow Italians. There was a considerable gap between North and South and much latent regionalism even in the North with Venetia and Lombardy not seeing themselves as automatically part of Piedmont. The imposition of the Piedmontese legal system, monarchy, administration and army made the notion of a unified Italy questionable. The issue is how far unity had developed by 1914. It could be argued that a restricted electorate and the whole system of *Transformismo* made the national parliament an ineffective unifying agent. Population growth and large scale emigration, especially from the South may have weakened unity. However, there was also more migration to the developing industrial areas of the North and communications improved with the greater development of railways. Imperial expansion and the development of Italian nationalism, the acceptance of Italy as a great power may have had unifying effects. The growth of socialism was a national rather than a local phenomenon; greater education encouraged more use of Italian and less of local dialects and urban growth tended to erode localism. How deeply these factors went however is doubtful.

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. Better answers will attempt to go beyond a 'list of factors which explain disunity' approach. Italian leaders did try to overcome problems and there was some development, particularly as the Italian economy grew so rapidly and there was greater reconciliation between Church and State. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 31</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

## 25 How unstable was the French Third Republic before 1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Born out of defeat and disaster and with Republic being associated with, as Thiers said 'blood and imbecility' it was surprising that the Third Republic lasted so long. Perhaps it really was the regime that divided Frenchmen the least. The early period was distinctly unstable but after 1877 there was the growth of Republicanism. The royalist alternatives were never strong enough to be a source of instability and the challenges by right and left were not really developed enough. Boulanger was a lightweight in 1889. The short-lived ministries and the scandals such as Panama might have been destabilising if any real alternative to the underlying system had existed. The upheavals associated with Dreyfus and the anti-clericalism of the Combes ministry were serious, and revealed deep divisions in French society. However, the unifying effect of the German threat and the ongoing desire for revenge and the recovery of Alsace and Lorraine may have been the stabilising element. The Franco-Russian alliance and the increasing nationalism with the strengthening of the army and better relations with Britain after Fashoda prefigured the anti-German unity of the years after 1914. Culturally and economically, there was growth after 1870 with obvious technological progress and Paris remaining an important artistic centre. Colonial expansion had not been incompatible with Republicanism and the emergence of stronger leaders helped bind France to the Republic.

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. The balance is between the very obvious areas of instability in parliament and in crises and challenges, the emergence of radical syndicalism and the Action Française show a polarization; scandals were divisive and Dreyfus saw the gap between army and people, clericalism and radicalism. However that does have to be balanced with elements of stability. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 32</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

## 26 How far was Germany to blame for World War I?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. This is a large area and candidates who focus on the outbreak of war could gain highest level marks. It is important for markers to be flexible here. The case against rests on militarism and military and naval expansion for its own sake; for failing to maintain the Bismarckian equilibrium between Russia and Austria; for provoking international tensions by aggressive diplomacy – especially in the two Moroccan crises and the 1908 Balkan crisis; for alienating Britain by the naval expansion after 1900 and indulging in an arms race; for open imperialism which challenged the interests of other powers; for failing to establish better relations with France and seeing the entente as a threat; for over-reliance on Austria as an ally and by supporting irresponsible Austrian policy 1913-14 especially the 'blank cheque'; for planning for war and being too willing to set the plan in motion; for allowing rampant nationalism to dominate national life; for conspiring for an eastern empire to gain vital resources. Much of this is challengeable. Germany did have to take cognizance of hostile alliances, especially the Franco-Russian alliance; the breakdown in relations with Russia was not one-sided; Russian military and economic expansion did have to be considered; the assumption that Britain should have naval superiority was not one that Germany had to accept; nationalism and militarism were not purely German developments, but common to most major powers; war plans were not a purely German idea and because of its special position, Germany needed to consider the possibility of a two-front war. The problems of the Balkans were not mainly of Germany's making. There were instances of Kaiser Wilhelm II attempting to resolve conflicts as well as promoting them, for example by naval negotiations and discussions over colonies. There is the view that all European powers were overtaken by events in 1914 and that considering possible war aims is not necessarily an indication that war was undertaken to fulfil them.

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. This is a major debate that has raged since the war itself and judgements are bound to be questionable, but better answers will focus on arguments rather than narrative and offer a supported view which is based on evaluation of evidence and may include some synthesis. If an answer is focused on the outbreak of war and is consistently analytical and balanced, this would be acceptable for the full range of marks. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 2011	9769	2c

### Section 6: Themes c. 1815–1914

#### 27 'The weaknesses of the Habsburg Empire were at the heart of continuing tensions between Europe's Great Powers.' How valid is this view of the period 1815–1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. This is a long period and candidates will have to be selective and better answers will draw parallels. In an attempt to keep a disparate Empire together in the Metternich era (1815–48) Austria repressed liberal and national movements and attempted to maintain monarchical solidarity through diplomacy. This created some tension between the Holy Alliance and the more liberal policies of Britain and, after 1830, France. It also contributed to the 1848 revolutions which affected long term relations between the powers. The Austrian role in the Eastern Question in opposing Russia, but not actually joining the Crimean coalition to fight her, created tensions. Key elements might be the desire of Austria to dominate Germany when it was becoming economically weaker than Prussia and excluded from the Zollverein, setting up a problem because the dynamic elements in Germany resented control by a declining multi-racial Empire. Austria's desire to maintain control of Italy when it had failed to win over Italian subjects caused problems which led to the war of 1859. The weaknesses which led to the *Ausgleich* in 1867 meant that, after this, Hungarian statesmen drew Austrian policy eastwards. In an attempt to bolster its position it drew the new Germany into alliance and clashed with Russia over the Balkans bringing about the First World 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 factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. The key is whether Austria was at the heart throughout the period, or more in the later part, and the relative importance of Austria as opposed to other factors. Some may see it as an oversimplification to put Austria at the heart of the problems given the weaknesses of Turkey and the role of Prussia in destabilising central Europe or the existence of mass nationalization, militarism and economic growth which led to social conflicts together with divisive ideas and ideologies. There is also the view that to speak of Austrian weakness is to underestimate both economic growth and the successes in dealing with nationalism and adapting to circumstances with domestic reform. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 34</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**28 Was Vienna or Paris the more important artistic centre in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Both have massive claims. They were both cities which dominated their respective countries and had grown hugely in terms of population. They drew artistic talent and had huge reputations. The Paris conservatoire was a major training school for musicians. The opera had a worldwide reputation and the *Opéra Comique* belied its name, encouraging works of huge stature such as Bizet's *Carmen*. The influence of the Paris dealers and salons on art was enormous. The late nineteenth century developments in Impressionism and Post-Impressionism influenced art worldwide. Vienna's architecture and music were probably more influential than the art of the secession. The home of psychoanalysis saw a culture which explored the subconscious and inner agonies of the creators far more than Paris. Schiele and Klimt occupied a different place in the art world than say Monet or Cézanne. Mahler and Schonberg inhabited a different culture than Ravel and Debussy. However in terms of international influence, the cities may be evenly balanced. Art Nouveau architecture swept Europe, but Paris had its own version, perhaps more influential in design and the applied arts. The harmonic world of Debussy was massively influential, but the New Vienna School revolutionised music even more. The Viennese classical tradition of Brahms had a greater influence on Northern Europe; but French operatic models had a greater hold on Spain and Italy. Theatre and literature flourished in both capitals, but the expressionist dramas and writings of Vienna paved the way for modernity perhaps more than the works of French writers and dramatists. Critically, some of Paris's art was too tailored for bourgeois tastes – the saccharine operas of Massenet, for instance. Some of Viennese art suffered from excessive formalism or grandiosity (Mahler's 8<sup>th</sup> Symphony, perhaps, or some effusions of the 12-tone system).

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. Much will depend on the definition of 'important' – important for producing masterpieces in their own right; important for leading artistic trends; important for modernity and experiment; important for guiding the future or innovating; or important for sustaining a tradition. There is no doubt that work of very high quality was produced in both capitals in this period, but the relative impact can only be assessed with some definition of importance or the resulting answers will merely be lists of masterworks. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 35</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

## 29 Assess the importance of railways for stimulating economic growth in this period.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. In Western Europe, railway construction can be seen as the main engine of economic growth in the 1840s and into the 1850s, stimulating growth in coal mining, iron, machinery making and civil engineering; railways made trade and industry more profitable, while bringing farms closer to growing urban markets and thus much more profitable. New managerial and engineering skills that spread from railways to other industries. Railways stimulated urban growth and urban markets grew as a result, stimulating economies. The profits from railways were fed back into the economy. However, not in all countries. In France, railways helped to modernise backward regions. The central government department brought in British engineers and workers, handled much of the construction work, provided engineering expertise and planning, land acquisition, and construction of permanent infrastructure such as the track bed, bridges and tunnels. Much of the equipment was imported from Britain and therefore did not stimulate machinery makers. The system did help modernize the parts of rural France it reached, but it did not always help create local industrial centres. They helped to promote a national market for raw materials, wines, cheeses, and imported manufactured products. The major effects of the railway system were probably political and military rather than economic. Other infrastructure needs in rural France, such as better roads and canals, were neglected because of the expense of the railways, so there is a view that there were net negative effects in areas not served by the trains. Belgium planned and funded a simple cross-shaped system that connected the major cities, ports and mining areas, and linked to neighbouring countries. Belgium thus became the railway centre of the region. The system was very soundly built along British lines, so that profits were low but the infrastructure necessary for rapid industrial growth was put in place. In Germany, by 1850, the railway network was beginning to be well-enough established to link most major cities, and each German state had lines within its own borders. Railways were a major stimulus to general growth in many cities, the new railway works became technical centres and the expertise spread from them to industry as a whole and the railways were a major stimulus for the growth of the new steel industry. German unification in 1870 stimulated further rapid growth. Unlike the situation in France, the explicit aim of government support of railways was to encourage industrialization, and lines served the Ruhr and other industrial districts, and provided good connections to the major ports of Hamburg and Bremen. By 1880, Germany had 9,400 locomotives which pulled 30,000 tons of freight. Russian railways developed later – mostly in the 1870s and 1880s. They were a major stimulus to the metallurgical industry, based on the coal mines of the Donets Basin and the iron ore of Krivoi Rog, linked by rail lines. It is suggested that Russian and German railways stimulated general economic growth far more than the railways of France, Spain and Italy, where railways often diverted capital and resources and may have even slowed industrialization in the latter countries.

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. Railways are seen as creating national markets, providing employment and being linked to industrial take off, bringing labour and raw materials, being the basis of urban growth and urban markets, developing capital markets. However they are not the only driver of economic progress in the century – population growth, new sources of power, technology and invention, canals, roads and shipping, the growth of capital markets and investment, the direct input of states, agricultural progress could be set against railway development. On the other hand, a lot of capital was wasted in failed or unproductive schemes and railways were sometimes merely for military/prestige purposes totally unrelated to real economic needs. The impact of railways varied in Europe and better answers will be more than a list of possible advantages. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

<b>Page 36</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 2011	9769	2c

**30 'Economic change was the main reason for growing political demands for women before 1914.' How justified is this view?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates should link economic change to growing political awareness. The second industrial revolution and rising population brought about urban growth. There were developments in employment opportunities for women with more industrialization. A growing middle class emerging from economic change meant greater demands for female education. Women were less tied to the land and worked in cities and towns more. Growth in communications meant that ideas spread more rapidly. Even in less economically developed countries like Russia there was more female political awareness, for instance in the participation of women in radical movements. Individuals like Vera Zasulich or Lenin's wife Krupskaya might be mentioned. There were some famous Russian female radicals. In Germany the growth of socialism resulting from industrial and urban growth led to female radicals like Rosa Luxemburg. Developing technology such as cheaper printing and typewriters, telephones, and more shops, opened up job opportunities for women. Growing education as result of economic change was a major factor in promoting political consciousness. The possible content is too wide for any specified or expected material to be included, but points should be supported. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events.

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. The alternative view might be that economic developments merely added to the exploitation of women. Organised labour was often hostile to greater political rights for women; the growth of a European middle class might have led to an idealisation of women and a desire for domestication which impeded political liberation. The petit bourgeoisie of the German *Mittlestand* opposed emancipation. Another view is that cultural factors were of greater importance or that purely political or social developments best account for greater female political awareness and demands. Women sometimes gained enfranchisement in countries where there was not necessarily major economic change. Where there was a particularly strong male dominated culture and tradition, economic change did not have such an impact. Where there was already a more libertarian tradition, then it might have reinforced existing demands. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 38</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

### 31 Why was so much nineteenth-century Thought hostile to established religion?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. There are many possible explanations and candidates could consider the influence of Romanticism, the French Revolution and Enlightenment rationalism. The Catholic Church seemed associated with the Old Order both politically and intellectually. The political, intellectual and cultural currents of the century tended to put man at the centre of things – through political liberty and the rights of the individual; through industrial and scientific progress; through cultivating the sensibility of the individual in literature, music and art rather than the formalism of the community. Radical political thought such as socialism and Marxism saw religion as part of a conservative social order, partly because the ancien regime had the first estate as a privileged class and the Papacy had stood against the French Revolution and later against Nationalism and Socialism. This became more pronounced with the Syllabus of Errors. Scientific thought and textual and historical scholarship cast doubts on Biblical explanations of science – especially Darwin and evolution. Psychology challenged religious concepts of morality. By adopting conservative attitudes, churches brought on themselves criticisms from nationalist thinkers. Modernity became associated with anti-clericalism in a way that it had not necessarily done in the previous centuries.

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. Not all factors may be of equal importance here and some, indeed, may challenge the question, making a distinction between religion in general and organised religion in particular. The interest in the transcendental by some thinkers later in the century came closer to religion than the arid rationalism and political anti-clericalism of others. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 39</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

## 32 Assess the consequences of demographic change in Europe in this period.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. In 1800, there were only 23 cities with over 100 000 citizens. By 1900, there were 135 cities with over 100 000 citizens. A major result of population rise was pressure on the countryside and changing patterns of internal and external migration. After 1750 there was more and more subsistence-migration. People did not migrate to earn some extra money, but to make their living. They needed money to buy a piece of land, to pay their taxes and their debts. More and more beggars and wanderers migrated through Europe. Cities with textile or heavy industry attracted labourers, just like commercial and administrative centres. People from all over Europe (after 1861 also from Eastern Europe) and even from other continents moved towards the new industry-centres. The Industrial revolution introduced new means of transportation that made it easier to move over longer distances. The changing balance between town and country and the overall growth of population had major economic, political and social consequences. The greater population saw increased demand and also increased supply of labour. The consequences of bad harvest or economic turndown could be great politically, as in France in 1847–48 or in Russia in 1905. States had to adapt to a larger population and there was the development of a mass electorate. Armies grew larger. Mass nationalism emerged. Transport developed to meet the need for migrations. A mass market meant changes in consumption. The growth of cities had huge cultural implications. Demographic change underpinned a great many developments in this period.

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. Candidates should go beyond a list for higher marks and offer sustained analysis which sees the links between developments. The exemplification possible is huge, so look for telling illustrations and some sense of dealing with the whole period for better marks. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 40</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

### Section 7: 1914–1945

#### 33 How is the defeat of the Central Powers in the First World War best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. In terms of resources, the Central Powers were disadvantaged and Germany's allies had significant weaknesses. However, so did Russia, and the modern military technology tended to equalise disparities in numbers of troops. German plans were postulated on the rapid defeat of France, which failed in 1914 and a war of attrition was not to its advantage, particularly with British naval superiority and blockade. The heavy casualties were a factor, but it was the entry of the USA in 1917 which has been seen as decisive. The failure of the 1918 offensive to gain a decisive victory before the arrival of the US forces in significant numbers is a major factor. Linked to this is the over-stretch of German resources in a two front war – even after the Russian collapse, large number of troops had to remain in Eastern Europe. Germany's allies had needed to be bolstered – for example the Austrians in Italy. Turkey was a distraction for the Entente powers, but not strong enough to withstand better organized campaigns in 1917. The U-boats mounted an effective challenge to Britain, but could not end the blockade and were a factor in bringing about US intervention. They were overcome by better British naval tactics. The supplies of war material and credit by the USA offered the Entente a major advantage. By 1918 a series of factors which interlinked probably led to the defeat of the Central Powers – the blockade, the series of defeats of Germany's allies, the arrival of the USA, the failure of Operation Michael, fears of internal unrest in Germany, stronger coordination of Entente forces and better use of tanks and air power and a crisis of confidence in German leadership.

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. The judgement is about the relative importance of long-term factors and the nature of the war of attrition that developed after the failure of the Schlieffen Plan and the shorter-term situation in 1918 which meant failure even after the defeat of Russia and generally better military performance on the western front by Germany. The issue of weak allies must be considered – but both sides suffered from this. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.



<b>Page 41</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

### 34 Have the weaknesses of the Treaty of Versailles been exaggerated?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The main weaknesses of Versailles have been seen as inconsistency in applying the principle of national self-determination; a punitive and unrealistic reparations policy; creating problems of minorities in new states; leaving Germany with lost lands which she would be bound to want to recover; making the settlement a diktat; trying to ensure that a major power had ineffective defences for an undetermined period; causing major economic problems; being over-motivated by French desires for revenge without taking the actions against Germany far enough to ensure that this was not countered by a German nationalist revival; lacking the means to enforce the decisions in the long term. The disposal of the lands taken by Germany from Russia alienated Russia and made the settlement unsustainable in the long run. The counter view is that much was successful – there was little opposition to Alsace-Lorraine being given back; there were plebiscites in some areas like N. Schleswig; the Germans themselves had been punitive at Brest-Litovsk and there was the need to take some action about areas of mixed nationality. It has been argued that the problems of reparations have been exaggerated and that they were not the main cause of Germany's economic ills as so little was actually paid. The demilitarization of Germany was undertaken amid hopes that general disarmament would take place. The emergence of rabid nationalism was not primarily the result of Versailles and indeed had the trends of the 1920s continued then the treaty would have been modified and a Franco-German rapprochement might have been successful. The Rhineland was evacuated by occupying allied forces earlier than expected and Locarno offered prospects of renegotiation. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events.

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. Candidates have the chance here to discuss a revisionist position rather than list the injustices and to consider whether the widespread criticisms of Versailles in post-war Germany were justified. No particular view is expected but better answers will display sustained critical analysis. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 42</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**35 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Lenin's leadership of Russia after the success of the Bolshevik Revolution.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. This is focused on leadership after October 1917. Lenin offered ruthless prosecution of the Civil War and a strong party. He also offered a realistic approach to Russia's problems. The peasant land decree is an example of putting political needs before political theory and so, arguably is the introduction of NEP, brought in after considerable peasant unrest and the Kronstadt mutiny. Even with a relatively small amount of support, Lenin was a confident leader, dismissing the Constituent Assembly and introducing wide-ranging decrees. He responded to the challenges of the Civil War with energy and initiative. The discussion is likely to be about the extent to which modifications to Marxism amounted to weakness or whether they showed a strength of vision to secure power first before carrying out a full revolution. The increased reliance on repression in the form of the Cheka, grain confiscations, red terror may be seen either as a sign of weakness – frustrations of a remote intellectual – or of being prepared to overcome scruples and to create the strong and ruthless central power needed to defeat enemies. The increasing tendency to ignore debate and to insist on 'democratic centralism' can also be interpreted in different ways, as can NEP. By 1921 there were indications that unrest had reached a point at which the Bolsheviks might suffer the same fate as the Tsar. After Trotsky's brutal suppression of Kronstadt, Lenin announced NEP which was explained in ideological terms as part of an overall plan to create the preconditions for socialism in Marxist terms. It was seen by some as an 'economic Brest-Litovsk', a retreat in the face of circumstances and a betrayal of principle. Some may discuss Lenin's physical weakness and the failure to secure a strong succession.

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. Better answers will offer a balanced judgement, being aware that Lenin had weaknesses – the over-reliance on confiscations and repression under War Communism; the drastic peace of 1918 based on a misplaced belief that world revolution was imminent for example. Some may not be impressed by the mixture of rigid violence and concessions; others may see that for an ideologue like Lenin to be prepared to be flexible requires a degree of strength and confidence. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 43</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**36 Did the maintenance of the Hitler state depend more on the repression or on the cooperation of the German people in the period 1933–39?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The enabling legislation gave Hitler full rein to use police power against his enemies. Communists had already been legally persecuted after the Reichstag Fire decree; police were augmented by auxiliaries from the SA; the SS were used to intimidate; concentration camps were established first on an ad hoc basis and then with regular rules, but little protection for inmates; censorship of the media and a ban on political parties ensured opposition had to go underground. Control by block wardens and local party activists, watchfulness by employers and teachers, the willingness of people to inform on neighbours and colleagues, careful record keeping by the Gestapo and an atmosphere of fear coupled with efficient organization of the security forces under Himmler and Heydrich meant that the Nazi state achieved and sustained a very high level of repression which increased once war began and when what remained of normal legal processes could be abandoned. Condemnation by people courts, the summary executions and the wider use of 'protective custody' put the police state onto a new level after 1939. The leadership principle ensured that discipline and obedience came before any recognition of citizens' rights. However, the picture of total repression has been modified by recent historiography and research which suggests a greater degree of consent. Gestapo personnel were not as numerous as say, those of the Russian KGB or the post-war Stasi and depended on following information from ordinary citizens. Surveys suggest that greater discipline and punishment for non conformity were welcomed by many Germans. A poll of 1952 showed considerable numbers of Germans thought that Hitler was the best leader that Germany had. Genuinely popular measures in the 1930s went alongside repression, which fell heavily only on certain groups – Jews, Communists, religious dissidents, nonconformist groups like rebellious youth or homosexuals – rather than on the population as a whole, which were largely unaffected. The greater prosperity and social welfare together with foreign policy successes and the improved facilities may be as significant as either repression or propaganda against which it is normally discussed. With the advent of war, as in most countries, national survival was associated with the ruling party and greater controls were accepted – but until the later stages, Germany did not suffer massive shortages because of the influx of foreign food, labour and goods from conquered Europe. It has been argued that the Nazi regime bought popularity and acceptance as much as or even more than it enforced it on an unwilling people.

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. This remains a somewhat controversial area and evidence is not always decisive. Better answers will show an awareness of different factors and will approach them with a critical sense, developing a view which may offer some synthesis. Better answers may draw a distinction between different periods – the period after power, the relaxation of the mid-1930s, the growing radicalism after 1938 and the special circumstances of war. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 44</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**37 'A popular and successful peacetime ruler brought down only by the fortunes of war.'  
How valid is this judgement on Mussolini?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Successes might include actually maintaining himself in power after the instability of governments before 1922 and retaining enough traditional elements – the monarchy and alliance with the papacy – to reassure Italians of some continuity. There were some successful economic policies and prestigious public works schemes and in foreign policy Mussolini did succeed in making Italy a more important element in world affairs than any of his predecessors, or possibly successors. Repression was not as extensive as say Nazi Germany or the USSR. There were some attempts at modernization of infrastructure, repression of crime in the South, new social harmony in the Corporate State and the conquest of new territory overseas with Ethiopia where slavery was abolished and a more modern administration established. There are obvious challenges to this view: the over valuing of the lire; the limitations of agricultural policies, which benefited some sectors only; the poor performance of some industrial sectors; the failure to mitigate the effects of depression; the increasing extremism evidenced by racial policies which found little support; the shallowness of ideological change; the growing dependence on Hitler; the unpopularity and losses of the intervention in Spain; the failure to engage with the young as youth movements became banal or tedious; the dominance of propaganda over achievement. However, there were few indications of sustained or effective opposition until the war; Mussolini was still respected and even courted by European powers right up to his fatal decision to go to war in 1940, when the inadequacies of the regime were revealed. Mobilization was inefficient; equipment poor and morale low. Italian forces suffered defeats in Africa; they were ineffective in Greece and on the Eastern Front. In the end Mussolini was simply dismissed by the King as an unsuccessful minister.

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. In a sense the question is artificial – the whole trend of Mussolini's policies in the 1930s led to war; but there is room for discussion about the pre-war achievements and success. Better answers will offer a framework by defining their interpretation of 'success' in the context of Italy's position in 1922 and draw some distinction between the 1920s and 1930s, particularly the period after 1935. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 45</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

### 38 Why did the Second World War last so long?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. This needs some reflection on broad trends which could include the failure of Germany to avoid war on two fronts after 1941. The continuation of British resistance, protected by the RAF and Navy meant that German resources were stretched by a world conflict at sea and having to garrison Western Europe (30 divisions in Norway alone) against a possible counter attack. Britain on the other hand could not invade and defeat Germany, so a prolonged standoff ensued. Similarly Japan had made rapid conquests but could not bring the war to an end; America needed time to gather resources and the dogged Japanese resistance over a huge area of the Pacific in places which were hard to attack meant a prolonged struggle. Allied dispersionist strategy of waging war in peripheral areas – North Africa and Italy – prolonged the war by delaying invasion of Northern Europe until 1944. The ideological nature of the war against Russia meant that a separate peace was not possible and the nature of the regimes and their carelessness of life meant that immense casualties were acceptable and the war was prolonged to the bitter end in the East. Germany had considerable resources from its 1939-41 conquests. Its war crimes and extermination policies meant that its leaders could not compromise. The allied position of unconditional surrender was based on two countries not fighting on home soil and the third being committed to post-war expansion at all costs. Cultural and historical elements prevented Japan realising the inevitability of final defeat after the defeats of 1944. Generally public opinion in all countries accepted a non-surrender policy which extended the war. The links between separate conflicts – Japan's war against China; the war of the Far East colonial powers to recover assets taken by Japan; the ideological war in Russia; the war by Germany to recover lands lost in 1919 and the desire of Britain and USA for a stable and democratic Europe and the struggle of the Nazi state for a new world order meant that it was hard to end any of these conflicts even when there was not the slightest hope that the original aims could be achieved.

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. Better answers will see the war as a whole and give a balanced answer dealing with more than Germany; there will be some sense of linking explanations and some sense of discrimination between various explanations. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 46</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

### Section 8: 1945–2000

#### 39 To what extent was Stalin to blame for the development of a Cold War in the years 1945–49?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Stalin has been seen as to blame for his expansionist and brutal policy in Eastern Europe in which agreements at Yalta were broken and communist regimes imposed in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia and the Baltic States annexed. Comecon and Cominform have been seen as examples of Soviet imperialism; Expansionist tendencies were seen in Iran and in the maintenance of a very high military build up behind the 'Iron Curtain'. Stalin was blamed for an attempt to starve out East Berlin and for backing repressive communism in North Korea. Stalin was seen as a threat of the West, especially with large communist parties in Italy and France. Spying activity suggested a desire to undermine the west and the emergence of a Russian atomic bomb confirmed Stalin's hostile designs. Stalin however may have been justifiably suspicious of the west after the long-delayed Second Front and the obvious hostility of Truman, Churchill and Attlee to Communism. Pre-war Eastern Europe had been hostile and he needed a buffer zone against future invasions. He did not attempt to invade Finland and kept his word about Greece. Russia argued that they had not broken Yalta and that the democracies they had established in Eastern Europe had a popular element to them. The dispute over Berlin could be said to have originated with the West's merging of zones and creating a common currency. The Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid seemed to be based on the desire to impose Western ideology and 'dollar imperialism'. NATO was an overt threat. The hostility of western 'iron curtain' propaganda seemed akin to that of Goebbels (who coined the phrase) and with the west enjoying a monopoly of atomic weapons; it was justifiable for Stalin to be alarmed and to maintain control of areas of strategic importance to Russia. Cold War historiography has veered between these polarised interpretations

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. Better answers will attempt a balanced view and will not rely on descriptions of schools of history but look at the evidence behind the arguments. Accounts of 'orthodox' and 'revisionist' views with a 'post-revisionist' resolution will not score highly unless they are supported with selected knowledge and genuinely assess arguments. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 47</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**40 To what extent and why was the USSR able to control its satellite states between 1953 and 1989?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The nature of the Soviet take-over with the suppression of elites and possible resistance; the use of well-developed repressive tactics; the overwhelming power of the Red Army; the divisions between opponents; the lack of intervention from the West; the availability of local supporters and the lack of developed democratic traditions in some, if not all areas are general explanations. The effective use of propaganda, the provision of some benefits – jobs, cheap housing, educational opportunities, a minimum standard of living, control of media and communication with the West may be considered. The promotion of popular entertainment (various people's palaces) and of cultural and sporting opportunities; the portrayal of western life as consumerised and ethically barren might have influenced some to give genuine support to a socialist ideal. There are instances of unrest which could be analysed and their failures explained – the East Berlin uprising of 1953; the Hungarian Revolt of 1956 and the Czech Crisis of 1968. There was some modification of repression and control and concessions were made for example in Poland and Czechoslovakia. Some local communists like Gomulka combined communism with sympathy for local needs. The nature and scale of repression changed, too. For example the Stasi relied more on surveillance and petty discrimination than in wholesale murder by the 1970s. The cumulative effect of communist rule and the acceptance of certain aspects as the norm helped. Some may consider what finally did end the domination – greater awareness of the gap between East and West was important but in the end it was change within the Soviet Union, so from this it might be argued that the major element was the determination of the Soviet leadership to enforce with the power of its military force its rule in eastern Europe. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events.

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. There is a chance to exemplify from a range of countries and to consider the relative importance of local factors, the positive aspects of communist rule and Soviet repression. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 48</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**41 How important was economic prosperity in maintaining a stable republic in West Germany after 1949?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. For Erhard and Adenauer, who had seen Nazism emerge on the back of economic depression, it was important to sustain prosperity and it has been argued that the economic miracle was the bedrock for the development of a democratic conservative West Germany. With little unemployment, buoyant consumerism and sound economic links with France and other EC members, prosperity was linked to international cooperation, moderate republican parliamentarianism and capitalism, offering an alternative to communism and Nazism but ensuring that the voters had a vested interest in the system. There were alternative explanations. The Christian Democrats and Adenauer offered stable leadership with conservative elements of continuity. On-going US support gave West Germany direct aid and a support for its institutions that Weimar lacked. The loss of the war and the opprobrium brought on Germany by the revelations about the holocaust gave every incentive for its people to reject the immediate past. The virtual Russian occupation of the East and the memories of Russian revenge in 1945 discredited undemocratic systems; the US example offered good standards of living, good consumer choice, improved communications and political freedom. After the trauma of the Nuremberg trials, the desire of West Germany's Western allies to put the past behind them and build up a stable bastion against the USSR prevented a prolonged period of punishment and recrimination and helped the new Republic. Some have argued that the Nazis destruction of the left and the trade union movement and the eradication of the old Prussian military elite during the war allowed the FDR to start afresh and that these factors as well as simply prosperity should be considered. West Germany preserved traditional federalism and built on parliamentary traditions that pre-dated the Third Reich. It avoided the instability of Weimar by having a strong leadership and provided its citizens with a secure way of life by working with its foreign backers and large scale industries in the context of a peaceful and cooperative European community. External threats from the east acted as a binding agent and the 1933–45 period indicated what to avoid. The lack of large scale social change reassured conservative elements but frustrated younger people. However, for much of the earlier period of the Republic, memories of hardship and defeat were strong enough to override opposition. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events.

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. Better answers will make explicit the links between prosperity and stability and weigh the relative importance of this admittedly very large factor, linking it to other elements. Many will consider that the quality of political leadership both promoted and used economic growth and this may be the key factor. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.



<b>Page 49</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**42 'A decade of poor leadership brought about the end of the USSR.' How valid is this view?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The issue here is whether it was the long period of decline and the overstretch caused by the USSR's desperate attempt to keep up with the USA in the arms race and to maintain itself as a super power when its economy was inadequate for the purpose that best explains the decline, or whether more specifically the leadership of Gorbachev and his predecessors in the 1980s were to blame. Gorbachev's Perestroika and Glasnost policies and his crucial decision not to deploy massive force against opposition within the soviet empire can be seen as the key reasons for the fall of the system. After the death of Brezhnev in 1982, leadership of the Soviet Union passed to Andropov and Chernenko in rapid succession. A series of weak rulers, economic failure, discontent in the republics, disillusion with the war in Afghanistan and failure to compete with the West had changed the whole position of the Party. On March 11 1985 Gorbachev became General Secretary and ruler of the USSR. Gorbachev was well aware that problems of all sorts plagued the Soviet state. He inherited a stagnant economy plagued by shortages, an inefficient agricultural system unable to meet the needs of an expanded urban society. Influences from the West had been harder to keep out and there was a decline in enthusiasm among party members and a strong sense of corruption that had spread from Brezhnev downwards. In terms of defence, the USSR had fallen behind the West and its technology was uncompetitive. There was no certainty that, despite the Brezhnev doctrine, it would maintain its Stalinist empire. Gorbachev responded to the Soviet Union's problems by introducing Perestroika, or economic restructuring, and Glasnost, an element of political freedom. Perestroika was unable to reverse the collapsing Soviet economy despite Gorbachev's best efforts. Corruption and bureaucracy were far too entrenched in the economy for legislation to make a dent in the economic crisis. Changes in the economy caused concern and insecurity and Gorbachev did not receive foreign help at a crucial time to help with the switch that China had made after Mao's death to a more modern economic system. Glasnost was more successful but the first free elections in over seventy years occurred in 1989 and reformist politicians swept into power in regional positions across the nation. Boris Yeltsin captured a seat in the new Congress. Gorbachev faced the consequences of relaxing a repressive system and this led to unrest in the Soviet Empire. But the unrest was not solely a result of Gorbachev. His decision not to use military force to put down revolutions in Eastern Europe further eroded the power of the Soviet Union during 1989 and 1990. The fall of the Berlin Wall was a massive turning point. Non-Russian minority groups throughout the Soviet Union agitated for independence during this period. The Baltic Republics led the way in demanding freedom from Soviet occupation. By this time a military solution was impossible. The failures in Afghanistan had demoralised the armed forces and led to considerable internal discontent. However not all welcomed internal moves to capitalism and an acceptance of greater participatory democracy and change. In August 1991 a group of right-wing military and KGB leaders staged a coup in Moscow while Gorbachev was in the Crimea. Boris Yeltsin gained international acclaim when he occupied the Russian White House and faced down the threats of the leaders of the coup. The coup failed, but Gorbachev was forced to greatly reduce the power of the Communist Party in order to prevent further attempts. Gorbachev's authority was compromised and he did not take the position of using all out military force to regain control. In 1991 Gorbachev and Yeltsin negotiated the transition of power made inevitable by the will of the people. Although Gorbachev tried to preserve some form of socialism and union among the Republics, he was unable to convince either Yeltsin or regional representatives. On December 1, 1991 all non-Russian republics of the Soviet Union declared independence and the USSR collapsed.

<b>Page 50</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

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. There are some key concepts here about which candidates could take different views. The question seems to relate Gorbachev to the very weak leadership which followed Brezhnev but it could be argued that his strong leadership was responsible for unforeseen consequences. Also it could be argued that the real reasons went beyond the 1980s to long term consequences of the ossification of the Stalin system after 1953 and an outdated adherence to 1930s planning models which were not serving their purpose. It could also be argued that the long term strains of sustaining a cold war arms race and the economic performance of the USA and capitalist Europe were factors that were of more significance than particular leadership deficiencies in the USSR. There are opportunities for discussion here and examiners should be prepared to be flexible and consider relevant analysis positively. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 51</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**43 What best explains the successful transition in Spain from dictatorship to democracy after the death of Franco?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. After Franco's death there was a transitional period which paved the way first for a new constitution and national elections and then devolution of power to the regions without fragmenting the state. Despite an attempted military coup in 1981, the transition to democracy was effective and general political stability despite challenges from dissidents to right and left has been maintained without the sort of national disintegration seen in Yugoslavia. There are many explanations. Some stress the willingness of political groups to be moderate and to avoid polarising politics, especially in the late 70s and 80s when a new generation had to adjust to democratic politics with very little previous tradition. Economic explanations point to the economic expansion and prosperity of the late Franco era and the avoidance of large scale inflation in the transitional period. After an economic crisis in the late 1950s the Franco regime allowed expert elites to effect a modernization programme which improved Spain's infrastructure and laid the foundations for greater prosperity. Spain's links with Nato and the European community were helpful in the transition in providing effective role models; the left was less inclined to offer an uncompromising opposition to democracy when neither China nor the USSR were seen as outstanding successes – this was in contrast to the 1930s. The repression of the Franco regime had weakened left-wing extremism, but the exiled leftist parties gave Spain one model of political organization. The monarchy was helpful in leading conservative Spain to accept democracy and defusing the right. The new Spain had the advantage of good leadership with a clear aim of settling national issues before bringing about regional devolution and being able to manage moderate change, underpinned by economic prosperity. It was helpful too that few expected the dictatorship to last beyond Franco's death and that Franco, unlike Mussolini or Hitler, had not been the figurehead for a fascist movement but rather in the mould of a military dictator loyal to the monarchy.

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. The balance may well be the influence of change in the years before 1975 and the way that political leaders managed change after 1975. External factors can be balanced with purely Spanish elements. There will be some discrimination between the relative importance of factors in better answers. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense 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.

<b>Page 52</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

### Section 9: Themes c. 1914–2000

#### 44 How important has been the role of the state in industrialisation in the twentieth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The obvious example of massive state initiative is the Stalin industrialisation in the 1930s with the creation of new complexes, the overall state planning, the allocation of resources and the creation of a mythology of industrialization with the Stakhanovite movement. The state elevated industrial growth to a major cause and created an infrastructure partly by the use of slave labour. It was a model for Eastern Europe and to some extent Asian industrialisation after the Second World War. However, early Russian industrialisation under Witte showed the state taking a less direct part, but nevertheless underpinning industrial growth by tariff policies, loans and grants and acting as a major customer. The Fascist industrial models shared some of these aspects by encouraging growth but working in the main through private companies and cartels except when necessity demanded direct state creation of industry. The democracies adopted some nationalisation of necessary infrastructure, especially railways and in Britain's case after 1945 power, coal and other aspects of transport, but direct control, for instance of iron and steel, was for a limited time. The periods of total war meant that the state was a considerable customer and did control output. Nevertheless industrial growth has depended less on direct state control in some countries, even though the state has at different times and in different countries played a key role.

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. Better examples will move away from being example-led to consider different aspects of the state's role in different areas and at different times. Some may assess the success of the state – the greatest amount of state intervention has not necessarily meant greatest efficiency, productivity or responsiveness to national needs. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 53</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**45 Assess the importance of the Second World War in bringing about the decline of European overseas empires.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The debate here is whether it was the war that brought about decline or whether the rule was already under threat before 1939 and the war merely accelerated trends, or whether it was post-war developments that were key. In some cases, for instance the loss of Italy's colonies, the war can be totally blamed. France attempted to restore its overseas empire in 1945 and did not consider the defeat and occupation any reason to abandon it, but the rise in national feeling in South-East Asia with the struggle against the Japanese was a major factor. However, it may be that the Communist victory in China was the greater element. The victories of the Japanese certainly eroded white prestige, but in other ways the war reflected the strengths of the British Empire, with the empire again rallying to the cause. The roots of Indian independence go far beyond the war with concessions having been made since 1909 and home rule agitation going back at least to the 1920s. However, the economic and military strains of the war made it difficult to allocate sufficient resources to hold on to India and Indian independence was a major change that influenced desire for change in other areas. It also strengthened the resolve of Britain not to give way – Malaya was defended and there was a struggle in many African colonies and Cyprus before independence was granted. That depended on factors that were not all linked to the war but on changes in post-war attitudes and changes internationally, such as the Cold War and US disapproval, as shown in Suez in 1956, for continuing imperialism. France too was keen to retain Algeria and Indo-China as a result of the Second World War. The relinquishing of Algeria has much to do with the circumstances of the 'savage war of peace'; Arab nationalism was not as greatly influenced by war as Asian nationalism.

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. The possible range of examples here is very large and better answers will avoid example-led answers but focus on factors in the war which speeded decline and making a comparison with existing agitations deriving from the rise of Communism. Experience in the First World War as well as the Second; and also factors which are more properly rooted in post-war experience. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 54</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**46 How is the gap between modern artistic developments and popular culture best explained in this period?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Before the twentieth century people may have been shocked by artistic developments, but they could grasp the point of the music, painting, sculpture, and writing. What puzzled them was the aesthetic and not the content. With modern non-representational painting and sculpture, or architecture which seemed not to aim at comfort or beauty, or music which had little in the way of tunes or recognizable themes, or books and poems which treated words as objects rather than elements in a coherent story or recognizable lyric, a bigger gap emerged. What could explain this could be purely aesthetic elements. For example once impressionists put colour and form before representation, they made possible post-impressionism and modernism which eliminated representation altogether. Once harmony was freer and dissonance acceptable, say in Wagner's later works, then composers could abandon tonality or harmonic rules and simply paint in sound, taking away any association of key with mood or notes as melody such as Webern or Varese. Another explanation could be based on historical context. The decline of patronage; the advent of photography and the possibility of art for its own sake went along with the decline of traditional power structures. There was no need for painters to offer accurate portraits; there was less of a disciplined hierarchy. After the Russian Revolution, painters and artists were freed from bourgeois convention and patronage, for instance, though Stalin brought back the arts to popular understanding by force. The First World War had seemed to many artists to destroy all accepted moral norms and much art of the post-war period reflected randomness, violence and self-expression independent of a mass audience. However, many of the trends had already been there before 1914. Did the feeling of imminent dissolution that was common in the pre-war period affect artists like Stravinsky and Picasso? The Futurists and Post-Impressionists like Kandinsky? Did elite patrons feel pride that only they and a small number of connoisseurs could understand these effusions of self? Was Freud and the discovery of the self-conscious a reason for abstraction and irrationality being acceptable and works produced which lay beyond ordinary culture lovers or the general public?

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. The better answer will not be example-driven and will offer some discrimination between different explanations, possibly seeing that some explanations base themselves more on purely artistic considerations and some see a stronger relation between art and the milieu, social, political and intellectual, in which it is produced. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 55</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

#### **47 How important were the world wars in changing the status of women in Europe?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Factors which have influenced change have been the greater need for women's labour in times of total war and the ending of social restrictions under pressure of necessity. Women have served in the forces and played a vital role in agricultural and industrial production. Expectations of women and by women have changed. In some cases it resulted in greater legal rights and enfranchisement. In some cases existing prejudices and assumptions have been challenged. Kinder Kirche Kuche, for instance, was simply not feasible in Germany when there was a labour shortage in vital defence industries from the mid-1930s. Victorian ideas of a woman's place fell away in 1914. However, war often reflected existing economic and social changes. Late nineteenth century urban and industrial expansion increased social mobility and created more opportunities for women. Pioneers in emancipation pre-dated the wars. Changes in technology and medicine were not related to war, for example wider contraception, changes in family size, domestic appliances which changed housework, the coming of the pill etc. Educational changes were well under way before the wars and war actually impeded progress in some cases. Economic expectations were a key factor. Though related to war, the greater prosperity in Western Europe after 1945 transformed expectations for women and increased the need for more qualified women. Greater leisure opportunities, economic development in tertiary sectors offered greater opportunity, as did the option of starting families later and having more child care facilities. In Eastern Europe the ideological impact of revolutionary socialism, with more emphasis on social and sexual equality, was a factor. This did partly come about through the impact of war, but the ideas derive from pre-1914 intellectual trends. Support of governments for equality is a factor that does not necessarily derive from war, as gains in both wars proved temporary.

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. The balance in better answers will be between the key factor and elements which pre- and post-dated the two world wars. Examples will be drawn from different countries and the essay will not be driven by examples but there will be a flexible use of knowledge. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

<b>Page 56</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

#### **48 Assess the importance of the cinema in popular culture in this period.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Cinema became a potent force in popular culture very quickly after the initial developments and may have reached a high point in the 1930s. Regimes were quick to see its political potential and the cinema became a major propaganda device in revolutionary Russia, Italy and Germany and in the democracies in wartime. It was used to persuade and to form a communal response to outside dangers. Eisenstein's *Alexander Nevsky* is a good example. Outside this, cinema could offer escapism or frame tastes – film star fashions were copied; perceptions altered. The image of a period was often created by film, for example the post-war Italian realists. Or the expressionists of Germany in the 1920s. The expansion of cinemas in Europe as grand popular palaces was significant in offering the public more than simply music hall/cabaret entertainment but something more culturally significant. Art films and popular films were often linked – Powell and Pressberger, for instance, combined entertainment and high visual art. Wartime propaganda films were not necessarily crude efforts but employed the best talents. Goebbels did not allow his Berlin studios to present a diet of crude propaganda only. The importance of cinema in shaping culture was widely recognized. The post-war period brought a bigger gap between film as entertainment and film as art. Continental directors offered self-consciously artistic and important movies to make audiences see cinema as a form like painting or music. (Bergman, for instance or Fassbinder or Fellini). Film though continued to hold a mirror to contemporary society (Truffaut for instance or the post-war Italian directors like De Sica) or to warn (Truffaut's *Fahrenheit 451*, for example) as well as entertain. Sometimes popular genres were adapted for higher artistic purposes by European directors. With the post-war accessibility of television the role of film and its popularity and centrality in popular culture declined. Its role changed to offering experiences more extreme than TV permitted or to allow audiences to indulge in collective emotions to be recalled at home when films were bought on video and DVD. The relative importance in popular culture compared with say TV, popular music or IT- based entertainment declined by the 1990s

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. The focus must be on the importance and this could be approached in aesthetic, political, emotional or social terms so some definition would help and some awareness of change will appear in better answers. There is an enormous range of exemplification possible, and better answers will use this effectively and not be drawn into descriptions of individual films. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.



<b>Page 57</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

**49 To what extent do economic factors explain the growth of and development of the European Community?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The European project was an attempt to overcome the nationalist conflicts of the first half of the twentieth century, especially the rivalry between Germany and France that had contributed to both world wars. After 1945, there was a strong will to ensure that war between Germany and France could never again occur. The mutual damage that political strife had inflicted was too great. In the post-war atmosphere idealists were keen on a revival of the 1920s accords and this was particularly pressing given the emergence of the USA and USSR as superpowers. This led to a series of schemes that culminated in the establishment of the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1957, which eventually became the EU. Led in the early 1950s by Frenchmen Robert Schuman and Jean Monnet, the initial plan was for a European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) that would make France, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg co-operate by forcing them to share their coal and steel resources in the rebuilding of Western Europe after the war. This created the organisational model that was adopted by the EEC. The EEC was established under the Rome Treaty of 1957. Primarily, the EEC aimed to extend the principle behind the ECSC to other areas of trade by creating a customs union. However, it also had more political ambitions for European integration – described at the start of the Treaty as creating ‘an ever closer union between the peoples of Europe’. Compared to the EFTA model, the EEC did have implications going beyond economic integration. The early years of the EEC were principally focused upon developing the customs union. During this period a huge economic boom, led by a dynamic West Germany, created much greater prosperity in Western Europe and drove forward the liberalisation of the EEC economy. There was a political element as was shown by France vetoing British entry in 1963. The British decision was partly motivated by concerns about the decline of the Empire and over-reliance on the USA, who had proved a less than reliable ally. There was the feeling that the EEC somehow reflected modernization and progress and was more than a means to greater trade. By the 1970s, when Britain, Ireland and Denmark finally joined the EEC, the project had slowed down considerably. Although the 1970s saw the first proposals for monetary union the EEC of nine found it more difficult to reach agreement than the original six had. It was not until the mid-1980s, at the time when Spain, Greece and Portugal joined, that the pace of European integration really picked up again with the agreement of the Single European Act 1986. This laid down a timetable for the completion of the single market while looking towards creating monetary union and driving forward the agenda for political union. There was probably more agreement about economic aims; but the political implications of a single currency were too much for Britain. The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the reunification of Germany in 1990 provided a huge boost to this process. The change from the Cold War meant that Eastern Europe could express its political independence and perhaps ensure security by joining Western Europe. The decline of the Russian superpower left the USA predominant and there was some feeling that a united Europe could be a counterpoise. In 1992, the Maastricht Treaty transformed the European Community – turning it into the European Union (EU), giving it new roles in the areas of foreign and domestic policy, and setting a timetable for the creation of the Euro. Subsequently, the Treaties of Amsterdam (1997) and Nice (2001) expanded these 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 factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. The origins of the EC lie in the political and economic consequences of war. At different times the relative importance of political and economic union has varied. Different countries see European Union in different ways and there is no consensus about the future political directions or possible influence on world affairs that ‘Europe’ might have. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

<b>Page 58</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2c</b>

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.