

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 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 2012 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

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

Introduction

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

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

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

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

Band 1: 25–30

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

Band 2: 19–24

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

Band 3: 13–18

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

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

Band 4: 7–12

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

Band 5: 0–6

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

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

Section 1: c.1715–c. 1774

1 'An age of reform.' How valid is this view of France under Orleans and Fleury ?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. What happened under the regency could be seen as superficial concessions only, lacking principle and vision. What happened could be seen primarily as political expediency with no real change. Better case could be made for Fleury. Still traditional and conservative? Peace and solvency mainly. Little done on Parlements or church.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. A case could be made, but only a thin one. An overview of the reign is looked for, with the likely answer being 'to a limited extent'. Those who reflect on what might or might not constitute an 'age of reform' and then match it up with what actually happened in the period should do well.

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, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

2 Can Frederick II of Prussia reasonably be called 'an enlightened despot'?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. A case in favour can be made, the contrast between the writer, thinker, and architect with his focus on duty before rights, education, legal codification and a freer press. Yet on the other hand he was a brutal militarist. A sensible definition of the term is called for as well.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There needs to be thinking about 'enlightened despotism' and hopefully a good definition in this context. There needs to be a balanced argument each way. Candidates should consider what is 'reasonable' and also show awareness that they need to judge things by eighteenth and not twenty-first century standards.

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, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

3 'Essentially a conflict over colonies.' Discuss this view of the Seven Years War.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There are a variety of causes which might be considered, such as just another part of the ongoing struggle between France and Britain over empire and trade. However, there are a lot of other factors which might be brought in; Prussia and its struggle for growth/survival being an obvious one. Austria was out for Silesia and was anxious to reduce the power of its growing neighbour. Russia and Sweden also had plans which widened the conflict and there were French ambitions on the Rhine and in the Austrian Netherlands. Colonies and commerce played a part, but they were not the only causes by a long way. Hanover was an issue for the British and the whole balance of power/diplomatic revolution issue might be brought in.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and different interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The role of colonies and commerce should be covered and balanced against the wide variety of 'other factors'. A balanced case is looked for, and if there is a strong argument in favour of the proposition, then there needs to be real awareness of why the 'other factors' are of less importance.

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, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

4 'It was a period of continuous decline, in spite of heroic efforts to prevent it.' How justified is this view of Spain in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The dominant influence of the church remained in education etc. There were defeats, revolts, commercial failure etc. Yet look at the work of Orry and Amelot, Alberoni and Ripperda. Perhaps limited and piecemeal reform in the 1750s? Charles III and some good ministers such as Squillace.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There needs to be debate on the issue of 'heroic', and whether the efforts actually amounted to much. 'Continuous' also needs to be looked at, and just accepting the thesis is a very simplistic approach. Those who think carefully about 'decline' and consider what it implies should do well.

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, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

5 'The reign of Louis XV demonstrated all of the bad features, and none of the good ones, of the ancien régime.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Women and hunting dominated his life. Factionalism dominated the court and the ancien régime continued. The absence of any real religious, social or economic policy might also be stressed. Foreign policy remained depressingly the same. The range of possible 'features' of the ancien régime is considerable and there should be consideration of issues ranging from taxation to social rigidity. The 'good ones' offers more scope to the very able, but areas which could be considered range from the artistic/cultural/architectural through to the grandiose and expansionist.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Careful thought about what might be the bad/good features of the ancien regime will obviously gain credit, as will consideration of the 'all' aspect of the title. What is really being looked for is the ability to view the reign as a whole and consider it in the light of the question.

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, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

Section 9: c.1774–c.1815

6 How 'great' was Catherine the Great ?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There is ample scope here. The initial insecurity was overcome. The work in education, the legislative commission, institutional reform, government generally and her foreign policy all merit consideration, as do Pugachev and the costs of the wars.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There should be consideration of 'greatness' for the really high marks, some reasoned definition is needed as a baseline to start from. There needs to be a real debate about what she achieved. Other 'greats' might be considered for comparison, both within and outside Russia, and a long as well as a short term view could be taken, or both.

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, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

7 'The partitions of Poland can be best explained by simple geographical factors.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There are a lot of 'other factors' which have to be considered, ranging from the lack of allies, anarchic internal tendencies, a poor economy, Prussian duplicity, greed, Russian loathing and Austria's devious policies. Some awareness of the lack of any good barriers would help also. There should also be evidence that this is about partitions, and that reasons behind the different ones might vary.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. They need to rise above a simple list of factors. Geographical factors need to be balanced against others, and prioritisation with valid reasons needs to be present. The best should consider the role of 'geography' and in each case, Poland was very easy to march into, and contrast it with other factors.

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, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 12	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

8 Discuss the view that the Enlightenment played an insignificant part in causing the French Revolution.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The simple list of causes will need to be looked at carefully for relevance. What is expected is a good coverage of the possible links between the ideas of the enlightenment (and there should be some coverage of those ideas as well) and events/individuals. Obviously other causative factors need to be considered and expect to see examination of the usual long, medium and short term causes.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. What is looked for here is a good broad picture of what role, if any, the enlightenment played in the causes (and not the course) of the Revolution. Careful analysis of the part that it did play is expected, and then a case should be made out justifying the answer and contrasting the role of the Enlightenment with other factors.

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, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 13	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

9 What best explains the political instability of France between 1793 and 1799?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There needs of course to be a good range of reasons. Factors which could be considered range from the background of war, ambitious personalities, terror, lack of consensus, massive social-economic-administrative-political changes being imposed on a system which had undergone such a radical change as the execution of the king and the termination of a long-established dynastic system.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should rise well above a simple list of reasons. There needs to be identification of one or more central factors and then the building of a well reasoned and argued case for it. There needs to be prioritization and a clear answer. Hopefully there will be a good focus as well as definition of 'political instability'.

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, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 14	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

10 'Napoleon was not a great general, just a lucky one.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Lots of scope here. The issue of 'war became of itself an affair of the people' might be covered. There were great changes in the size of his armies, the scale of his operations and the nature of his objectives, while on the other hand, tactics and techniques did not change a great deal. His mass conscription, careers open to talent, training based on national characteristics and the focus on morale might be part of a case for 'greatness', as was his ability to move large armies at speed and his foresight in separating his enemies and placing his troops, decision making at critical moments and the 'blitzkrieg' methods of Ulm, Jena and Austerlitz. However, Russia, Waterloo, the absence of much of a staff, too personalized and a tendency to get bogged down in detail might form a case 'against'.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some thinking about 'great' and 'lucky' is called for, what might be the mark of a 'great' general and the extent to which one can make one's own 'luck'. With some definitions to work from, then expect a sound case each way on both parts of the question. Although he could be fortunate in his opponents at times, and their archaic methods, what he attained over a long period of time, and so often, was indicative of perhaps a lot more than luck.

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, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 15	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

Section 3: Themes c. 1715–c. 1815

11 Assess the impact of both slavery and the slave trade on the economies of 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. Black slavery was the basis of the West Indian economy and of the lucrative sugar production and trade. Between 1680 and 1780 the slave population of the British areas rose from 60,000 to 400,000 and in French areas it went from 70,000 to 800,000. 6million slaves were traded in the eighteenth century. Despite a slump in the 1730s, the profits from sugar grew and the Spanish began developing sugar on Cuba in the 1760s. Coffee and indigo were also profitable. Candidates may argue that the profits of production were greater than the profits of the slave trade itself. The profits rarely exceeded 10% and it is doubtful if reinvestment of profits in domestic industry had a large impact.

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. Some argue that slave-produced goods such as sugar and tobacco played a decisive part in stimulating consumer demand for goods in Britain and other West European societies, and thus in fostering the growth of industrial capitalism; the slave trade and its associated plantation trades were critical sources of capital for industry. The same trades played an equally important role in supplying capital to finance early industrial growth, There is some debate among economic historians about this. Candidates might point to the growth of ship-building; the development of ports which benefited from the Triangular Trade; the impact of wars fought over lucrative plantation colonies which depended on slavery; the creation of wealth and its impact on domestic demand and re-investment. Candidates are not expected to know the historiography of the debate but to assess the impact of the wealth generated by both slavery and the slave trade. Better answers will go beyond explaining economic consequences. No set examples are expected. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 16	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

12 'Essentially static.' Discuss this view of European cultural life 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. Candidates could exemplify their analyses from the visual arts – rococo; the classic portraits of the century; the cultivated landscapes and cityscapes; they could look at Palladian classical architecture and its imitators; they could look at the development of the classical style of music in the Viennese school or the classically-based operas of France, Italy and Germany; they could look at the classically-inspired poetry; the 'Sturm und Drang' period of the 1770s and the beginnings of Romanticism.

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 (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The discussion could be between formalism and a love for classical balance and subject matter which is often seen to have restricted individualism and expression and the dynamic elements within the style that actually developed it and pushed it more towards the emotionalism and individuality of later centuries. There could be some distinction between the last elements of the Baroque in the earlier part of the century and the beginnings of a more Romantic sensibility at the end. It is very important that no specific content is anticipated – but candidates will be expected to exemplify any generalizations made. If there is a strong analytical answer on a limited part of artistic life, then credit the analysis, discussion and knowledge offered rather than marking down for omission.

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 17	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

13 To what extent did the reasons for overseas colonisation change 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. From the mid-seventeenth century to 1800 the major change was the transformation of Europe into the major supplier of goods for the world rather than simply consuming colonial products. By the mid-eighteenth century the only substantial numbers of Europeans in colonies were the 650,000 Spanish – the other empires were largely trading outposts. There was a substantial increase in colonial populations. Some derived from plans devised by the home governments to exploit resources such as the attempt to develop Louisiana. The discovery of gold in Brazil was a stimulus to emigration. British governments subsidised German immigration. The greater numbers meant changes in administration – with Spain introducing local governors on the French model, Spain and Portugal tried to tighten control of colonial trade. In some possessions, the development of key cash crops led to an increase in slave populations. There was limited interest in establishing direct control unless necessary, but the nature of the relations between trading companies and native rules changed, for example in India where France and Britain recruited local rulers in the wars. The activities of Dupleix in India mark a change in the nature of colonial activity. The British East India Company official Clive virtually established British rule over Bengal as an independent initiative. Generally, there was a shift away from the old colonisers to the more vigorous maritime nations with a broader economic base and range of products.

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 strike a balance between continuity and change. For all the developments, trade and profit remained at the centre of Europe's interests and political control, mission and any sense of developing colonies were far more limited. Governments tended to see colonies and colonists as existing for the benefit of the mother country much as they had in the earlier phases – hence the shock of the American rebellion. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 18	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

14 How 'absolute' were absolutist monarchs 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. Candidates may draw examples from various monarchies and no set answer is expected. There may be discussion of the theories of absolutism and the seventeenth-century backgrounds; the outward show of monarchy – the grand palaces, the mystique and ceremonial kingship; the weakness or lack of representative institutions; the military power (for example in Prussia); the alliance with the nobles (the service nobilities of Eastern Europe, for example) and with organised religion. In some cases the lack of a middle class restricted dissent. On the other hand there were restrictions on the practical powers of the monarchs – Pugachev's rebellion shook Russia; tax riots and urban affrays were a constant feature; financial weaknesses brought about by the extensive wars of the period had a debilitating effect (e.g. France); regional variations undermined effectiveness (e.g. Spain); administrations even in the enlightened despotisms did not reach the levels attained by post-1789 regimes; communications remained a problems. Monarchs were sometimes seen as alien dynasties and much depended on the personalities of the rulers as to the extent and effectiveness of real power.

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 (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Better answers may grapple with the concept of absolutist in eighteenth-century terms and draw some distinction between states with limited urban development and a history of strong monarchy based on military power and states facing greater social diversity and the impact of social and intellectual development which challenged traditional authority. There may also be a distinction between monarchies which attempted internal reforms to strengthen their power and monarchies which were more static. No specific content is expected but better answers will use knowledge flexibly for exemplification and support of a discussion which attempts to estimate the level of absolute power and offers some distinction in terms of different countries and different parts of the century.

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 19	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

15 'A period of limited economic development'. Discuss this view of continental Europe 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. The growth in European population from 100 to 187 million did not produce much agricultural development outside Catalonia and the Netherlands. There was a general rise in prices after the mid-century pushed on not only by rising population and relatively low agricultural productivity and innovation but also the supply and circulation of precious metals. Wages did not keep pace, restricting demand. The position of labour declined and cheap labour and limited demand were inimical to agricultural development. There might be exemplification from many parts of Europe of lack of agricultural development and the failure to develop crop rotation and selective breeding on the English model. The aristocracies of Europe were not very interested in agricultural development. Serfdom in the east and inheritance laws restricted progress. The exceptions – localized speciality crops such as Mediterranean olives and the revolutionary developments in the Netherlands and Catalonia were exceptional but could be discussed. Investment generally was limited by the preference for conspicuous consumption among the wealthy. There were pockets of more productive use of money – for example in France; and there were developments in transport – France had good roads. Russia had begun canal development. Charles III of Spain built new roads. The Dutch developed banking and state banks were set up in Austria, Prussia and Spain and this helped to overcome the shortage of specie which was a major problem and restricted development. In terms of industry, outside England and isolated pockets, Europe was pre-industrial by 1800 with industry not a major employer. There were some areas of growth – e.g. Silesia or Russian iron development in the Urals and the military establishments encouraged production. The English factory system went against the trend of the century in metals, luxury goods and textiles for outwork. However, candidates could point to cotton as an innovative development in France and Spain. The technical and organisation developments of Britain had not spread to the continent by 1800. Trade was restricted by mercantilist policies but there was a movement for freer commerce. There was a reorientation of trade away from the very dominant Dutch at the start of the century towards Britain and France, though the Dutch were still important. After 1770 French trade lost out heavily to Britain and suffered from the disruptions of the war and revolution.

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 (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. As the agricultural technical and organisational innovation came in Britain rather than most of continental Europe, the main thrust of answers will probably be to agree with the question. However, there could be a more balanced response by looking at elements of progress – either in specific areas like the Netherlands, Catalonia, Silesia or the Urals; or by looking at infrastructural innovation like transport or state banking providing paper money. There was also the pull of greater demand on certain elements in the economy such as cash crops close to cities. It could be argued that developments made Europe readier for the greater transformations of the next century but the failure of investment to take advantage of the potential advantages of a growing home market and the distractions of wars, together with the general backwardness of the dominant agrarian sector was too great for significant developments.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

Page 20	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

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 21	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

16 How significant were the effects of urbanisation on European society 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. Towns were generally stagnant until the mid-century. In eastern Europe there was some contraction of urbanisation, with concentration in large centres like Moscow. Capitals grew fastest. London doubled in size; Paris grew, as did Berlin, Vienna and St Petersburg – though Paris and Madrid had a smaller proportion of the population of their countries than London or Amsterdam. The growth of large urban centres had an effect on social life where the rich and famous gathered with their servants; they attracted services such as luxury manufactures, legal services. However, the growth of urban centres could be seen to have adverse effects on economic development, taking capital investment away from the countryside into unproductive luxuries and building. The impact of urbanisation on cultural life – for example in Vienna or Paris or the operas in London and Naples, might be the lasting legacy of urban growth. There was less sustained growth in inland provincial towns. Influxes of population tended to strengthen the power of the guilds until reforms of the 1780s and 1790s. There was greater growth in cities and towns that benefited from overseas trade – Bristol, Liverpool, Cadiz, and Marseilles are examples. Growth here weakened traditional guilds; building boomed, in new towns – such as Birmingham and in many towns in the Southern Urals there was an influx of rural population which required adjustments. The effects might be seen as the growth of consumption – shops, luxury industries, fine houses, trades dependent on the rich. As urban growth was not accompanied by much in the way of compensating infrastructure, it led to over-crowding, problems with sanitation, disease. However, it was not all problems – urban skilled wages were higher; opportunities better than in the countryside; there were alms available from religious institutions which were common in cities; townsmen suffered less from seigneurial dues, forced labour, conscription and taxation than people in rural areas. However, there was also a great deal of urban poverty among incoming unskilled rural labour and the risks of unemployment. Many turned to crime and prostitution; begging was common. Candidates might write about social conflict and the lack of social controls – though this is not always the case. In some towns there was the growth of large scale workshops – Barcelona, Moscow, Berlin are examples with the danger of unrest in times of poor trade. Urban riots are a feature of the century. It would also be possible to consider the expansion in numbers and wealth and influence of the urban bourgeoisie and the political effects in the Netherlands and France.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The significance of effects should be the focus rather than merely outlining some of the results of urbanisation and the economic, social and political significance may be considered as well as the different effects in capitals, and in provincial cities. There can be links made between the social freedoms offered by growing cities, the economic uncertainties and the political opportunities. Some distinction could be made between regions and periods. France in the 1780s for instance stands out. Some may consider the cultural significance to be greater than other factors and there is a chance to discuss relative importance of the changes. Look for analysis and understanding rather than any specific line of argument or 'required' exemplification.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

Page 22	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

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 23	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

Section 4: 1815–1862

17 Assess the view that Nicholas I put the interests of the crown before the interests of the nation.

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. Nicholas I (1825–1855) faced a revolt on the day of his coronation, which he suppressed, and ruled as an autocrat, hoping by militarization and discipline to defend his dynasty and protect Russian interests, probably seeing the two as inseparable. Police activities increased with the creation of the Third Department. The government closely controlled education and imposed strict censorship. Dissent was met with punishment and Nicholas opposed nationalism and change in Europe – as ‘the gendarme of Europe’ he cooperated with Austria. He limited Polish rights and when unrest broke out repressed the Poles and ended Poland’s constitution and special status in the Empire, making it a province. He was active in opposing change in 1848–9 and intervened in Hungary to suppress the rebellion there against the Habsburgs. He supported the conservatism of the Holy Alliance, but not at the expense of Russia’s interest. He took advantage of the Greek revolt to fight Turkey in 1828 and 1829 and negotiated concessions at the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi in 1833. He pursued ambitions in the near East which led to the Crimean War in 1854. The failure to defeat and expel a Franco-British expeditionary force revealed the limitations of Nicholas I’s rule and his son embarked on reforms. Nicholas I was not a total reactionary and contemplated land reform and also expanded education, but he was seen as rigid in maintaining an autocracy based on military power, a militarized civil service and support for the Orthodox Church.

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 (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Nicholas would not have seen a distinction between the interests of the Crown and those of the people. To avoid the excesses of the French Revolution, the disunity that nationalism would have brought to a diffuse empire, to build up the armed forces and to promote Russian influence over the Turkish Empire and attempt to secure an outlet to the Mediterranean would have seemed to be serving Russian as well as Imperial interests. In the perspective of the weaknesses shown by the Crimean War and the failure to compromise with Europe’s more dynamic forces, the reactionary policies can be seen to have weakened Russia. The adherence to Austrian influence; the suppression of liberal criticism; the rigid censorship which made constructive criticism impossible and the over reliance on a large army which relied heavily on serf-soldiers and outdated technology; the failure to carry through plans to reform slavery and promote industrial modernization may be seen as failing to engage with Russia’s long-term interests in pursuit of the short-term interests of the dynasty in resisting change and modernization. However he did not put political ideology before the strategic needs of Russia; he was not blindly reactionary and his reign did see some agrarian and educational reform. It also saw quite a cultural flowering with Gogol, Pushkin and Glinka. Candidates may well see him serving neither the dynasty nor the people; but better answers will attempt a balanced discussion and define terms.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

Page 24	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

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 25	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

18 How valid is the judgement that Louis XVIII was the most successful of France's rulers in the period 1815 to 1848?

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. Louis XVIII was restored and then once again deposed. After the failure of the Hundred Days he ruled until 1824. Charles X was overthrown in 1830. Louis was unable to resist the influence of the Ultras after the murder of the Duc de Berri, but the earlier part of the reign saw, despite the White terror of 1816, some reconciliation. His brother restored the religious orders, increased penalties for sacrilege and revelled in symbols of divine right. The appointment of the arch-conservative Polignac caused opposition even within a generally conservative parliament. When the 1830 elections, even on the narrow electoral base of the Charter, proved unfavourable, Charles devised the Ordinances of St Cloud, imposing tighter censorship and restricting voting. A popular rising in Paris was not effectively suppressed and it was clear that Charles had lost elite support. Louis Philippe needed to try and reconcile the opposing elements in France and to reassure foreign powers; he wisely refused the offer of the throne of Belgium for his son and accepted the English nomination to allay fears of French domination. His forces defended Belgium in 1832 against the Dutch but he was careful to work closely with Britain. He was cautious not to pursue a nationalist or Napoleonic policy and did not help Polish or Italian resistance movements to avoid alienating Russia or Austria. He resisted Thiers' wishes to intervene in Spain on behalf of the liberals and had to accept international intervention against Mehemet Alis, France's near East ally in 1840. He withdrew an annexation of Tahiti when England objected. There had been some gains – Algeria was conquered and Guizot and Louis outmanoeuvred Palmerston by the affair of the Spanish marriages. Domestically there were only limited attempts to meet the challenges of growing industrialization though there was economic growth in railways, coal and iron. By 1848 there were signs of social and economic unrest and calls for parliamentary reform – the system allowed only a small electorate and the ministries were responsible to the King. Louis Philippe was faced with demonstrations that the National Guard did not disperse in 1848 and abdicated.

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 (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some may feel that this is an unfair comparison. An elderly and somewhat infirm Louis XVIII inherited the divisions of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic periods and the suspicions of the allied powers. He returned not because of massive enthusiasm for the Bourbons but because of Napoleon's defeats. He did not entirely resist unwise repressions, but he did not like the King of Piedmont, for example, attempt to turn back the clock completely – the Charter was not less democratic than Napoleon's Year X constitution; the administrative structure and legal reforms of the Napoleonic period were kept and the middle classes kept their property and the notables were not ousted by 'ultra' royalists. The indemnity was paid off and France became one of the leading powers again, playing an important role in Spain. Louis was the only one of these three not to be removed without coming back. Charles X has few defenders, though his Ultra supporters did see him successfully meeting the threat from impious republicanism. The fact that Louis Philippe stayed in power for a longer period and did have, it could be argued, a shrewd foreign policy and overcame opposition until social unrest and political discontent built up in the 1840s might give him some supporters among candidates – even if France was 'bored' by 1848. The bourgeois monarchy might appear to be modern and there was some economic development. Of this somewhat uninspiring trio, most will probably see Louis doing well to re-establish the monarchy both nationally and internationally; Charles throwing away the hard work and Louis Philippe unable to establish much that was positive – he was not Charles X; he was not a warlike and demanding

Page 26	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

figure like Napoleon and he stood against forces of dangerous and radical change. He did not make disastrous appointments like Charles X. Look in better answers for a distinct supported judgement but answers may not be equally balanced in their treatment of the three monarchs even at the highest level.

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 27	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

19 How important were economic factors in the creation of a united Germany in the period 1862 to 1871?

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 economic factors are likely to be the Zollverein; the economic growth of Prussia encouraged by the Rhineland acquisitions of 1814–15; railways; the urban middle classes and industrial interests needing the market opportunities of a united Germany; the wealth that allowed Prussia to create a well-equipped army. Keynes's famous view that 'Coal and Iron' rather than 'Blood and Iron' were the key factors may be quoted. Other factors that also explain unification are the skill that Bismarck showed in weakening Austrian domination and then ensuring that the other powers did not intervene to prevent the expansion of Germany. Denmark was not defended by other European powers in 1864. Austria was left without international allies in 1866 (though most of the German states sided with her). France fought and lost alone in 1870. Another key factor is the international situation after the Crimean War which was favourable – though Bismarck still had to exploit it and the military superiority – the power of the Krupps' artillery in 1870 and the famous needle-gun in 1866. The superior Prussian military organisation was aided by the railways which reflected as well as being a factor in economic development.

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 (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Better answers will not merely run through a list of reasons for Unification – the question does ask 'how important' economic factors were. Without the rapid economic growth Prussia could not have dominated the Zollverein, which certainly established the ideas of Prussian leadership. However, most of her free trade partners declared for Austria in 1866 even though Austria was not a member. Economic power could produce anxiety, especially when linked to Prussian military growth and traditions. The railways certainly not only boosted Prussian power but played a role in bringing the nation together – however national feeling, communications, cultural nationalism did not necessarily point to the actual way that Germany was unified. Economic growth did assist Prussian military victories and it is often pointed out that Austrian industry and railways were inferior. Against this the actual fighting was dominated by severe military errors on the part of the Austrian leadership in 1866 and by France. Railway logistics played their part, but railways did not win battles by themselves and the needle gun was not the war-winner that it has been made out. Economic historians have tried to write Bismarck out but though economic growth may well have made some sort of greater unification more likely, the particular course that unification took may well be seen as a result of Bismarck exploiting the opportunities that long term shifts in international relations made possible. Needless to say, no set answer is expected but there is the need to assess factors and reach a supported judgement for higher level marks.

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 28	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

20 'The importance of Cavour and Garibaldi in achieving a more united Italy has been exaggerated.' Discuss.

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 wording has been chosen carefully-Italy was not fully united by 1861 – and there are other elements which might explain the creation of the Kingdom of Italy. Cavour has been seen as offering the model of Piedmont as a progressive modern industrial state which was attractive to western Europe and to nationalist elements in Italy as a model. After the failures of 1848 Piedmont was the only Italian state to retain constitutional rule and Cavour helped to make this a greater reality than before. He took advantage of the Crimean war to bring Italy onto the European agenda; the key policy was the agreement with Napoleon III – 1848 had showed that Italy could not go it alone. With the French defeat of Austria and the sympathetic outlook of Britain, key elements were put in place for a more united northern Italy and the destruction of Austrian power. However, Cavour did not seek a united Italy and France's unilateral defection meant that what emerged was limited – Venetia remained Austrian; Austria actually lost Nice and Savoy. It was Garibaldi who ensured that Italy was more than a northern Italy by his heroic expedition to Sicily and by his policy of declaring his gains for the benefit of Victor Emmanuel and Italy and not for regional independence or a republic. Many saw the alliance between the clever diplomat and progressive statesman and the heroic man of action a sort of marriage between head and heart that brought about a 'resurgent' Italy.

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 debate is about whether either of these 'heroic' leaders really can be credited with success out of context. The economic development of Piedmont and the willingness of Victor Emmanuel to be flexible about the constitution depended on more than just Cavour. He was fortunate in the context of the 1850s where Austria lost support by not taking part in the Crimean War from Britain and France, while alienating her fellow conservatives in Russia by offering a diplomatic alignment against her. Her less successful rule of her Italian regions had created discontent; Italian nationalism had been stimulated by heroic revolts and by the relentless rhetoric of Mazzini and his followers. In the end France's willingness to pay the military price for Italy though exploited by Cavour, was not created by him. The state that he created by 1860 was far from being a united Italy and he was unenthusiastic about Garibaldi, trying to stop him and being concerned about his successes. Garibaldi for his part reacted to unrest in Sicily that went back some years and was part of a longer tradition. The role of Crispi in stirring up the unrest; the benevolent neutrality of Britain and the weakness of the Neapolitan opposition as well as the heroic leadership of Garibaldi must be assessed. However the rapid moves by Cavour and the King to annex the territories in the South as well as Garibaldi's loyalty in declaring his conquests to be for the King are key elements even if Rome and Venetia were added without input from either Cavour or Garibaldi as a result of Prussian expansion and the kingdom created by Piedmont's annexations was hardly united. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 29	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

21 What best explains the failure of the 1848 Revolutions?

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. It is not intended that equal treatment should be given to every revolution, rather that general explanations are exemplified and some sense of judgement is made about the strongest explanation. There were revolts in France with the fall of Louis Philippe and the proclamation of the second republic, leading to the presidency of Louis Napoleon and the Second Empire. Metternich was forced out by revolts in the Austrian Empire in Vienna, Prague and Budapest; there were revolutions in Germany which led to experiments in constitutional governments and also the formation of a national parliament in Frankfurt. In Italy Lombardy and Venice rose and Piedmont intervened to support before being defeated. Revolutions in Naples and Sicily and in the Papal States occurred. Resistance was prolonged in the Roman Republic and also in Venice before Austrian troops restored control. The lack of revolution in Russia gave the rulers in Europe an ally while the armies of Prussia and Austria remained generally loyal.

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 question does ask for more than a list of factors and national circumstances did vary. However there were common elements – the first was that Europe in 1848 was predominantly rural; the revolutionary middle classes and progressive liberal nobles did not secure the enthusiasm of the rural masses. Also the aims of the rebels were often quite disparate and the increasing fears of the propertied classes of popular revolution and socialist ideas made it possible for the rulers to seem to offer safeguards for property which led to splits in the movements. In many cases, regional differences prevented a united front, for example in Italy and Austria – where Magyar nationalism did not embrace other discontents and where there was little common ground between the North and South. The Papal allocution ended hopes of religious unity for change in Italy. Where a national assembly did emerge, for example in Germany, regional differences were not overcome by a strong and charismatic leadership. Charles Albert of Piedmont proved a broken reed and Frederick William of Prussia lacked the nationalistic vision. In France the emergence of a strong man in Louis Napoleon turned the course of revolution. However, military factors may have been crucial – the loyalty of Radetzky's armies, the strength of the Quadrilateral, Russian forces and the military inadequacies and organization of the rebels, the deployment of heavy artillery in Paris in June 1848. Better answers will offer some judgement about the most compelling explanation. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 2012	9769	23

Section 5: 1862–1914

22 Who gained most from the domestic reforms of Alexander II?

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 'Tsar Liberator' feared that emancipation of the serfs would come from below if not from above and was conscious of serfdom as a bar to the reforms that the Crimean War had indicated were necessary. Candidates may well give this major reform the greatest prominence. However, the creation of Zemstva; legal reforms including the introduction of jury trial; the relaxation of censorship and greater education freedoms together with army reforms including a reduction in the very long period of service amounted to a considerable change after the reign of Nicholas I. The reforms were not given without a lot of soul-searching and the Polish revolt and the development of internal opposition raised concerns and there was some reconsideration. Nevertheless, despite the rise of terrorism and assassination attempts the Tsar was considering extending political change when he was killed in 1881. The categories of those affected could include the serfs; the liberal aristocracy and middle classes; the students; the soldiers; local communities; the intelligentsia; the Tsar's bureaucracy and the ruling elites.

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 deliberately open question and no set answer is required. Some may consider that for all the limitations in terms of redemption payments and land redistribution, the peasants were the greatest gainers. The move from unfree to free was one of the most significant changes in Russian history. Some may argue that in fact the landowners gained more and the continuing peasant unrest is evidence that the peasants were discontented with the partition. It could be argued that the middle classes in Russia gained more from the greater educational freedoms, the growth of the opposition movements, the legal changes and the hopes that Russia was moving away from a narrow autocracy. However, given the failure to maintain all the freedoms given and the limited powers of the Zemstva, this could be challenged. It could be argued that change and modernisation actually strengthened the Tsarist state; that military reform gave its armies more power and that the overseas image of Russia was reformed for the benefit of the ruling classes. However against this is the growth of terrorism and opposition and the retraction of some changes which made the regime look uncertain and weak. The conditions for the soldiers may have improved, but the Turkish War of 1878 was not a vast improvement on the Russian performance in the Crimea. The Tsar paid a heavy price for stimulating demands for change that his regime was not prepared to meet. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 31	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

23 How liberal was the German Empire between 1871 and 1890?

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 question's subject matter is likely to be the nature of the Constitution, which made the federal Chancellor responsible to the Emperor; which counteracted the power of the universally (male) elected Reichstag with the Bundesrat and which took the key element in the budget, the military spending out of discussion for seven years at a time. Reference may be made to Bismarck's dealings with parliament; the 'liberal' policies of free trade, attacks on the Catholic Church followed by the realignment from the National Liberals towards a more conservative orientation; the illiberal persecutions of Socialism.

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 debate here is whether the constitutional limitations meant that the constitution was 'the fig leaf of absolutism'; whether Bismarck cynically used the National Liberals; whether he despised the whole idea of political discussion and whether his repression of his 'enemies' the Catholics and Socialists prefigured the anti-liberal tendencies of the Nazi regime; whether his true preference was for the Austrian alliance, protective tariffs and association with the right and whether he pondered a coup against the constitution later in his period of office making the Empire less than liberal. Against this are the efforts Bismarck made to secure parliamentary support; the federal nature of the Empire; the anticlericalism that was a hall mark of C19 liberalism; the relatively limited repressive apparatus deployed in comparison with later regimes or indeed the Metternich era; his concern for popular causes such as Imperialism. The whole issue of universal suffrage is often problematic – being 'liberal' in a modern sense but not 'Liberals' in terms of the beliefs of the National Liberals, who saw universal suffrage as akin to reaction. Much depends on definitions of 'liberal' and also which period is being discussed. Before 1879 the creation of a federal constitution with the Chancellor appearing before the lower house and attempting greater national unity while attacking Catholic ultramontaniam might have been pretty much what the pre-1870 Liberal programme had hoped for. Problems came when the more authoritarian nature of the regime and the spirit of the new Germany are considered. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 32	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

**24 'The French Third Republic survived only because there was no realistic alternative.'
Discuss this view with reference to 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. There is a strong view that the Republic was the regime which divided Frenchmen least – previous republics had been associated in Thiers's phrase 'with blood and imbecility' but the suppression of the Commune showed that the conservative Republic would not threaten property or return to the ideals of 1793. On the other hand, it could link to the ideals of Frenchmen who 'kept their hearts on the left but their wallets on the right'. It was not proclaimed in any frenzy of opprobrium for Napoleon III but because of unexpected military collapse. The alternatives were not enticing – the monarchists could not agree among themselves and the issue of the flag showed that their claimant was out of touch. The previous experience of kings was not encouraging. Bonapartism was associated with the failed 'glory' of Napoleon I and Napoleon III. The left-wing alternatives could not find support in a conservative peasantry. However, the humiliations of defeat, the recurrent scandals, the lack of inspirational leadership and the undercurrent of opposition meant that the Third Republic seemed quite precarious. The problem was that alternatives seemed even more so – the most dangerous period was probably the early 1870s and answers could analyse the weaknesses of conservative opponents and the gradual rallying of republicans to the cause. The Boulanger episode showed that 'the man on the white horse' could not rally the type of support that was true of 1799. The Panama scandals and Dreyfus rocked the Republic, but there was little in the way of a plausible alternative.

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 discussion could be about whether the failures of the Republic's enemies – from the 1870s royalists and MacMahon to Boulanger and to the Dreyfusards simply lacked credibility or whether there was vital and skilful leadership by republicans – Gambetta, Clemenceau etc. or whether it was the need to avoid a repetition of the splits shown in 1870–71 in face of the desire for 'revenge' and national regeneration to deal with Germany and regain Alsace and Lorraine that prevented any serious challenge to a Republic which did adapt to the changing times – the Russian alliance, the recovery from the splits of the Dreyfus period; the way that the Radicals dealt with Boulanger. There is no set answer but better answers will go beyond an explanation to evaluate the relative importance of the explanations. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 2012	9769	23

25 To what extent were the problems facing Italian governments in the period 1871 to 1914 of their own making?

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 may be analysis of the problems inherited from the Risorgimento period and the problems brought by population pressure, uneven economic development, the rise of a greater urban population and political discontent and the problems of pressure for world status and imperial greatness. There may be knowledge of the political system of trasformismo and the restricted and unrepresentative nature of Italian political life. Key figures like Depretis, Crispi and Giolitti may be assessed for their response to Italy's problems.

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 argued that the whole nature of the Risorgimento which had placed the Papal States and the South unexpectedly under Piedmontese control without real debate and choice engendered problems. The massive resistance and subsequent repression of the South left scars and a sense that the mezzogiorno was hostile and occupied territory. Italy in the 1870s suffered from poverty, overpopulation, regional inequalities, poor health and agrarian backwardness. The Piedmontese ruling class was left with problems which their Neapolitan, Tuscan and Papal predecessors had not begun to deal with. To these were added the strains of rapid industrial growth in the 1880s and the spread of anarchist and socialist ideas and the alienation of Catholics from the state. However well the politicians had ruled Italy, these problems largely inherited would have been overwhelming. However, the alternative view is that the political system made matters worse and perpetuated abuses. The trasformismo politics debased parliament and led to accusations of scandal and corruption confirming the view that the new kingdom was alien rather than organic. The attempts to make Italy a great power strained resources and took capital and attention away from issues such as land and social reforms. It could be argued that Giolitti's attempts to deal with Socialism were more successful but created problems of their own. It might be argued that the emergence of radical agrarian politics and urban discontent were simply not dealt with by adopting reforming measures that had been seen in other European countries facing similar situations and that domination by a northern ruling class perpetuated regional alienation. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 34	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

26 Assess the view that the military planning of the great powers, rather than their long-term rivalries, best explains the outbreak of the First World War in 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. Taylor's War by Timetable may be referred to here – the key idea is that the massive military buildup before 1914 and the detailed plans such as the Schlieffen Plan involved the mobilisation stage and once this had begun it was difficult for the powers to wind down in 1914. The wider view is that the plans made war seem a viable option to fulfil longer-term ambitions or remove long-standing anxieties. Countries went to war with the view that there was a good chance that they could win. However, there were of course long-term rivalries – the French resentment about Alsace Lorraine and the defeat of 1870; the Russian concern for the Balkans and the dangers of a German-supported Austria; the Austrian fears for the long-term security of the Empire. Germany and Austria's fears about Russian economic and military growth; Britain's economic, colonial and naval rivalry with Germany; Germany's fear of encirclement. The issue is whether these longer-term rivalries would have by themselves led to a war had not statesmen had the confidence of military advice promising victory.

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. Some may take the view that the war arose out of a short-term crisis and developed because of short-term elements such as the mobilisation. It could be argued that when a major crisis came the planning offered the prospects of a short-war and victory, even though any study of campaigns such as the US Civil War might have indicated the opposite. The Schlieffen Plan offered a rapid campaign against France similar to that of 1870 and used Russia's sheer size and anticipated slowness of response to argue that a war on two fronts could be avoided. French concepts of high morale and rapid advance being able to overcome the effect of rapid firing weapons and heavy artillery offered a tempting vision. British belief in its naval superiority and the sheer size of the armies of Russia and France encouraged a view of a short campaign without large scale land fighting. Few military leaders set out what were to be the realities of a long war of attrition for the politicians. However, some may feel this is a shallow view – the war was a culmination of a buildup of long-term resentments, economic and colonial rivalry, strategic issues and the development of mass nationalism – this was the context in which the decisions of 1914 were taken. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 35	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

Section 6: Themes c. 1815–1914

27 Account for the importance of the Eastern Question in European diplomacy between 1815 and 1878.

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 decline of the Ottoman Empire from the C18 led to Balkan nationalities trying to break free and encouraged the ambitions and interests of Austria, Russia, France and Britain which led to rivalry. Britain saw it as a cardinal interest to keep Russia out of Constantinople to protect her trade routes and her Asian possessions. Russia sought to protect her co-religionists and also to exploit opportunities to control the routeway to the Mediterranean and her Asian and Balkan influence. Austria was eager to prevent Russian expansion and to defend her own Empire in South-East Europe. Candidates might follow these rivalries by considering the question of Greek independence which set the nationalism of the Greeks against the post-Napoleonic Congress system and its monarchical commitment to the status quo. It was England France and Russia who accepted Greek independence in 1827. Full independence depended on Britain and Austria being fearful of a Russian-dominated semi-independent Greece.

The interests of the powers in the conflict between the sultan and Mehemet Ali could be discussed – with Russia as the protector of the Sultan in return for the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi. France's sympathy for Mehemet Ali introduced a new element following the Turkish invasion of Syria in 1839. There was danger of conflict between France and Britain and the British policy in securing the Straits Convention. The Eastern Question led to war between Russia and Turkey in 1853 and the Crimean War in 1854. The demands that Russia withdraw from Moldavia and Wallachia and return her fleet to Sebastopol had already been met, so this 'last crusade' as Figes calls it, had wider objectives and the entrance of Piedmont showed that the Eastern Question could be a sort of peg to hang other European issues on. The Treaty of Paris proved hard to enforce and the Balkans were an ongoing problem, culminating in the risings in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1875 and the subsequent war between Turkey and Russia, the Treaty of San Stefano and the Congress of Berlin.

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 look at key themes rather than offering a run through of events, but a chronologically-based analysis should be accepted if the stress is on explaining and analyzing importance and how that changed or was constant over the period. Answers could look at Russia's interests and how they became influenced by pan-Slavism as well as strategic concerns. Austria's interests did not lead her into conflict in the way that Britain and France were drawn into war in 1854. The changing role of the Eastern Question in Franco-British relations might be shown as questions of prestige arose by 1854 which linked domestic and foreign policy. British interests were to protect the Mediterranean; but in 1856 domestic pressures and concern for prestige were important. The role of Balkan nationalism might be analysed. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

Page 36	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

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 2012	9769	23

28 Why was there a greater commitment to imperialism among European powers after 1870?

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 Imperialism was predominately centred on Africa and Asia and involved European powers in greater formal control. It was made possible by better technology – the Suez Canal and steamships. The new telegraph made better links with the home country and new medical knowledge lessened the risk from tropical disease. As the new 'scramble' for colonies lacked effective regulation, it created conflicts which in turn encouraged imperial expansion for protection of borders. Some areas were developed and defended for reasons of trade and economic gain. Others, like British Egypt, because it dominated a key communications route – the Suez Canal. The Belgian Congo was developed predominantly for economic profit. Countries valued fuelling bases on strategic routes. In some cases colonisation was a result of powerful pressure groups. Domestic considerations such as with Bismarck's colonial acquisitions could be important; Disraeli's Imperialism was seen as popular but also dominated by 'the men on the spot' who forced their government's hand, but so could the desire for international prestige – such as French and Italian colonization. Colonisation in areas seen as primitive such as the African interior took different forms from foreign domination of China or British rule in India and her willingness to share power with white colonists in Australia. Possible explanations can be a sense of civilizing mission, often linked to religion; the desire to control resources; strategic considerations; the need for capital investment outlets; the impact of the 1873 downturn in the European economy; enthusiastic local imperialists; mass communications informing a nationalist public of colonial adventures and opportunities; greater weaponry such as the machine gun which facilitated victories. Sometimes there were special circumstances such as the discovery of gold in the Witwatersrand in 1886 which transformed relations between Imperialist powers and native peoples. Rivalry between powers could be a powerful stimulant, as in South Asia, where the French established control of Indochina; and the British carved out colonies in Burma, Hong Kong and Kowloon. Russian, British, French and German concessionary ports were forced on China.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. There are a considerable range of explanations possible – contemporaries like Hobson and Lenin saw Imperialism linked to the development of capitalism; but the economic arguments cannot always explain the considerable sums spent on imperial acquisitions with limited pay back in terms of trade and investment opportunities. Often the less formal imperialism yielded far more than the more costly annexations. Imperialism was not always popular – the French interest in Indochina by political leaders was not shared by a public more interested in European concerns. Attacks on 'Beaconsfieldism' won the Liberals the election of 1880. The Boer War became unpopular. Leopold of Belgium's depredations in the Congo gave colonialism a bad name. An over-arching 'major factor' may not emerge, but candidates will try to look critically at a range of possible motives and use effective exemplification for higher marks. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 38	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

29 Assess the importance of music in the development of nationalism 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. Eighteenth-century music by and large was international in style – the classical sonata form did not lend itself to folk songs, though they do appear in Haydn symphonies for colour and interest. Italian opera was enjoyed throughout Europe. Mozart was a multi-lingual artist, at home in London, Paris, Prague and Vienna. With Romanticism there was more interest in exploring national characteristics. Weber's operas used German folk tales and explored German history for themes. Glinka welded some Russian elements on to the standard Italian opera style of his day. However, as the 'national' schools developed, then they did become focal points for national feeling. German nationalists were united by German music in the 1840s – even though composers were not especially 'Germanic', but with Wagner 'Germanness' was celebrated in music. Die Meistersinger is a hymn to German virtues and there are anti-foreign sentiments in the last scene. Germanic folk lore permeates the Ring even if its message is universal. The Czechs, though under Austrian rule, delighted at the growth of a Czech musical school expressing Czech culture – a distinct 'national' turn of phrase, Smetana's Czech subjects – village life or episodes from history and mythology – were used to combat German influence in culture. Chopin was adopted as an expression of Polish nationalism; Erkel – more than the more cosmopolitan Liszt – wrote national Hungarian operas. French composers were seen as having specific national characteristics of lightness and sophistication as opposed to the heavier German style after 1870. The Russian nationalist composers – the Mighty Handful celebrated folk music. Some musicians went into the countryside to collect traditional melodies. By the 1880s there was no longer an international style but different expressions of nationalism in music and a decline in interest in the more cosmopolitan composers of the past who did not reflect this.

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. Some have seen music as a major factor in the sense of national identities; but its impact varied. It was greatest when actually taken and used by a nationalism that had evolved independently of it – such as the association of Verdi with anti-Austrian feeling as crowds shouted and chanted Viva Verdi as an acronym of Vittore Emmanuele Re d' Italia. There is little evidence of the great man's gloomy operas inspiring nationalism. In the bitter struggles between Czechs and Germans in the Austrian Empire, struggles to get Czech music and opera performed might result in a victory for nationalists and there is more expression of national feeling here, perhaps. Wagner was taken up by German nationalists with different degrees of enthusiasm – he was not to Bismarck's taste, but the Kaiser and later Hitler saw his works as expression of the superiority of German Kultur. No doubt national music stirred their patriotic middle classes, but did little for the peasant masses who would have found the sentimentalising of rural music incomprehensible had they ever been able to hear it in the concert hall or opera house. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 39	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

30 What best explains the growth of Socialism 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. Having its roots in the French Revolution, socialism developed from a doctrine to a more organized political movement and some have seen the years 1830–1848 as crucial and Blanc, Saint Simon and Fourier as the key intellectual movers. Thereafter Marxism and Anarchism developed and 'socialism' in a broad sense developed intellectually. Marxism in particular gave it a pseudo-scientific authority and appeal whereas anarchism and syndicalism broadened its appeal to the developing industrial masses. Organizationally, the Internationals saw a new departure and within countries, socialist parties emerged. The link with trade unionism was also a vital element in growth with the powerful CGT in France and CNT in Spain. The German SPD had become the largest party in the Reichstag and French and Italian socialists had entered government by the end of the 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. Explanations may focus on the development of socialist theory, particularly that of Marx, which offered not merely anti-capitalist feeling but a 'scientific' theory of historicism and closely argued economic theory to counterbalance the prevalent free market liberal economics. Marx offered less in terms of how the revolution would come about in practical terms, but with the aid of Engels he offered well-supported analyses of the inevitable decline of capitalism. Lenin developed the theory in a way that offered hopes to Russia's predominantly agrarian society and the political organisations developed in Germany, inspired by theoretical Marxism, seemed to show that socialists could organise and gain support on a large scale. This essentially urban world view was helped by the rapid industrial growth of the later nineteenth century and the often poor working and living conditions that accompanied it. Attempts at persecution, as in Germany and Russia, often strengthened the movements and gave them heroic status. The cyclical depressions of capitalism seemed to prove socialism was right and the greater interest in social matters gave ammunition to their theoretical claims. The role of individuals must not be forgotten, with socialists achieving respect and prominence – Jaures, Lassalle, Keir Hardie and so on. Mass communications and rising literacy and education together with the parallel growth of organized labour meant that ideas spread. Better answers will offer a judgement on the key elements. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 40	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

31 Why was there more industrial growth in western than eastern Europe before c.1880?

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. Answers may well focus on industrial growth. The trading economies of Britain, Belgium, and France had a strong capital base and the profits from agriculture were invested more in Western Europe than was the case in the centre and east. The less rigid class distinctions made commerce and industry more socially acceptable – though Russian nobles did develop industries. However, the serfdom in Eastern Europe put a brake on demand-led internal markets, a flexible skilled labour force and scientific progress. There were particular factors – the dismembering of Poland; the high level of military expenditure in Russia; fear of speculative thinking; the imbalance between town and countryside. The free market capitalism that developed railways and steamships was not a feature of eastern Europe. Political absolutism often retarded education and new ideas. By the end of the period there were signs of a rapid growth rate in countries hitherto dominated by a backward agrarian-based agriculture like Russia and Italy. However smaller eastern European states like Serbia lacked the infrastructure and the urban development and markets to emulate smaller western European states like Belgium. There was also no eastern European equivalent to the Zollverein in central Europe. Candidates might discuss transport development, heavy industry, high farming – both east and west shared population growth and new technology but there were considerable differences in capital formation, the availability of skilled labour, the growth of a resilient urban market and the role of international trade.

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 might be possible to deal with the question in terms of the economic development of France, Prussia, Russia; but better answers will offer sustained comparisons of key factors with exemplification from both west and east and offer some judgement about the relative importance of different explanation. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 41	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

32 What is the most convincing explanation for the failure of women to achieve political equality with men 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. The C19 was a period of change and development and recent studies have stressed achievement. However, despite powerful theoretical justifications from the time of the French Revolution onwards, there was no political equality. Candidates may point to the limited political rights enjoyed at different parts of the century and in different countries by any citizens. The reaction to the French Revolution produced a conservative backlash and ideas of female political rights might have been seen as an excess of the revolution. Even when ideas did emerge, there was little hope of implementing them. This was partly a matter of entrenched male ideas on equality even in relatively sophisticated urban societies. In more traditional rural-based society there was even less chance of women being seen as potential political equals. At root was sexual inequality reinforced by economic inequality. As industry developed so came the need for mass cheap labour in key industries such as textiles. Domestic service with its connotations of personal serfdom and inferiority was dominated by women. The rising middle classes needed women to work but also to idolize and there developed a false double standard in which the 'eternal feminine' presented in artistic visions was spiritually above the coarse male world of politics. Urban growth may have inhibited equal rights. On the other hand the rise of political radicalism did involve female participation – often in very direct form as terrorists and agitators. However, there was relatively limited progress in Europe of this radicalism so it could not be a vehicle for political equality. From the time of the revolution, politically ambitious women had powerful enemies – Napoleon was particularly hostile to Mme de Stael and the French political revolutionaries like Mme Roland were treated with animosity and their leading lights executed. The influence of a male dominated church; the restricted educational opportunities for women and the negative impact of economic growth might be considered. Candidates should not use this as an opportunity to show that women compensated in other spheres – the arts, social work, charity, education or as workers in new industries – without linking it to the question. Did this mean that energies were dissipated from the political struggle?

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 many explanations, some of which are more compelling at different periods and in different countries. Better answers will offer a judgement on relative importance and assess how convincing different arguments are in context and use exemplification from the period. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 42	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

Section 7: 1914–1945

33 How far does poor military leadership account for the high casualties of the First World War?

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 case for this proposition is the reliance on frontal assaults, mass attacks, the failure to see logistic problems (Gallipoli), the failure to modify tactics sufficiently (Haig at Passchendaele perhaps a classic example); the failure to learn from the experience of others (Pershing, for example); the tendency to keep going when victory was clearly impossible (the Somme); the persistent belief in morale and élan (Nivelle 1917); bloody and unimaginative tactics (Falkenhayn at Verdun); over reliance on plans that could not be adapted. The case against would be the limitations of the heavily defended front lines; the impact of heavy weapons and new technology; the insistence by politicians and the public on victory at all costs; the sheer size of armies. The generals can be defended and there were efforts to avoid high casualties – e.g. Vimy Ridge; the German storm troops in 1918, the rapid adoption of tanks. The question does focus on casualties, not general effectiveness, so beware general discussions of 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. Better answers will consider the case against the generals and offer some evaluation – no set answer or judgement is required – but the focus should be on casualties. The allied tactics in 1918 for instance, were more successful in using combined operations, but casualties were still high. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 43	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

34 Assess the view that the League of Nations never had a realistic chance of success.

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 case for this is that it was seen from the outset as being associated with the victors of the war; that USA and USSR were not originally members; that there was domination by Britain and France but these countries lacked real commitment to it; that the post-war world was so disturbed that any international body like this would have been challenged; that there was no military force; that nationalism was too strong for the League to have much chance. The case against is that the effects of war had been so terrible that public opinion was prepared to support the League; that it did enjoy some successes in the 1920s which pointed to it not necessarily having no chance; that too much can be made of US absence – the US sent observers and was not totally isolationist; that it was remarkable that it did establish an infrastructure and do good work in its various commissions – refugees, health etc. The cataclysmic effects of depression and the rise of dictators did undermine it, but that did not mean at the time of founding that it was necessarily unrealistic.

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 question is not 'explain the failure of the League' but requires an analysis of what its prospects were – lists of reasons for failure will not reach higher bands. Better answers will offer a discussion. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 44	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

35 How valid is the judgement that Stalin sacrificed ideals for power in the years 1929–45?

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 case for this view may be that Stalin became increasingly dictatorial and undermined communist ideals which never envisaged a 'cult of personality'. Instead of ruling in the interests of the people, he imposed a ruthless discipline to build up industry for the good of the state; his purges had little relation to ideology and were more concerned with power or even paranoia; he was prepared to deal with his ideological enemy Hitler; when war came, older ideas of patriotism and the motherland were invoked and the churches re-opened in order to survive. The acquisition of the old Tsarist Empire and the domination of eastern Europe had more to do with Russian power politics than ideology. The case against is that by 1929 the original ideals of the Revolution had been undermined by the pseudo-capitalist NEP and that by collectivization and mass industrialization Stalin was back on ideological track. If the communists were the party of the proletariat, then a proletariat had to be built up. The discipline needed for this massive piece of social engineering was consistent with Marxist ideas of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The social changes of the 1930s were truly democratic even if not in the bourgeois sense, with industry being highly valued; peasant proprietorship being abolished and all working for the good of the greater socialist community. Some may know the revisionist view that Stalin was pushed from below by activists who wanted greater ideologically-based change. The war was won by the effort of the whole people and communist ideology spread after it. The regime might have been brutal but it was not inconsistent with ideology.

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 understand the ideology and relate policies to it and attempt a sustained discussion with a judgement. Weaker answers will outline main elements of policy and offer either an unbalanced judgement or merely comment that particular policies were or were not ideological. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 45	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

36 How great a part did luck play in the rise of Hitler to power as Führer by 1934?

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. What lies behind the question is the view that Hitler had advantages not of his own making. He was lucky not to have been ruined by 1923 and allowed to become a national figure by sympathetic elements in the judiciary. He was lucky that economic circumstances turned in his favour; he was lucky that when he had reached the furthest point in electoral success in 1932 without gaining office splits in Weimar's ruling elite allowed him to negotiate his way into power. He was lucky that the radical wing of his party did not press their opposition to compromise; he was lucky that the army was willing to do a deal in 1934. The counter argument is that Hitler made his own luck and exploited circumstances – the decision to switch to a policy of legality, for instance; the organisation of the party to be in a position to exploit the economic crash; the studiously effective 'message' and the brilliance of its delivery were not matters of luck; the way that Hitler kept his nerve and did not give in to demands for radical action in 1932; the way that he saw that entrance to government could be the way to power and how he outmanoeuvred Von Papen and the *Reaktion*; the *Realpolitik* in abandoning the SA and compromising with the army, knowing that he could in the long run control them as well all amount to a high level of political skill.

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 the debate clear and offer a balanced analysis and discussion, reaching an informed judgement. Less effective responses will offer reasons for the rise of Hitler with some comment on luck, but the concept of 'luck' may not be central to the answer. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 46	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

37 Who should bear the greatest responsibility for the outbreak of civil war in Spain in 1936?

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 candidates may be Franco and the generals who launched a military coup in 1936. However, this was quite widely supported and the rise of right-wing political extremism may be linked to this – not just the Falange and Spanish fascism but more mainstream Catholic organizations. The church was also supportive of the Nationalists and could be blamed for political interference. Against this, the rise of the extreme left – syndicalism and anarchism; the rabid anticlericalism which threatened traditional religion; the Popular Front which threatened stability (or offered justice according to political persuasions). Perhaps the international context should be blamed; or long-term factors like the dictator Primo de Rivera; or the politicians' failure to achieve reconciliation and consensus; perhaps the army 'africanistas' who developed an outlook hostile to democratic government. Perhaps the world depression rather than particular groups and individuals could be blamed; or localists in Spain who threatened to revive traditional autonomy and pull the country apart.

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 rather different question than 'explain the causes of the Spanish Civil War' and some may not have thought of the issues in terms of responsibility – some may merely blame the right – but no particular judgement is looked for; better answers will engage with the concept of 'responsibility' and consider alternative explanations. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 47	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

38 How important were economic factors in bringing about the Second World War?

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 idea behind the question is that the expansionist nationalism of Germany, Italy and Japan was linked to economic conditions. There was a desire to create closed economic systems – especially in the case of Germany and Japan – which would be isolated from the economic vicissitudes which had brought hardships in the inter-war period, would provide markets and raw materials, an outlet for surplus population and national security. Rearmament and expansion would ease economic pressures at home; the rise of Mussolini and Hitler had been brought about by economic discontent and their warlike policies were linked to offering economic gains. In terms of the allies, the domination of Europe by the dictators offered economic challenge; the threat by the Japanese to the Far East Empire had economic repercussions; it might be argued that economic factors led Britain and France into appeasement and the USA into isolation and so helped to bring about 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 counter view is that ideological and strategic interests were far more important. The desire for Japanese expansion and a Thousand Year Reich were cultural/political/ideological rather than merely being for economic advantage. Economic gains were more a means to an end – to impose racial policies, for instance. In Mussolini's case the decision to invade Ethiopia was more political than economic and Italy had little to gain economically from joining the war in 1940. Better answers will attempt a discussion, though even for highest marks this may not be balanced, but should go beyond merely explaining economic considerations and offer some evaluation and judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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.

Page 48	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

Section 8: 1945–1949

39 How far was the USA to blame for the development of the Cold War from 1945 to 1949?

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 revisionist view sees Truman and US policy makers unable to see Stalin's genuine defence concerns and interpreting the policy in Eastern Europe not as part of wartime agreements (e.g. the percentages agreement) and recompense for the huge sacrifice of the USSR – much greater than that of the west – but as ideologically motivated. The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan are part of a US desire for strategic domination and to protect markets in Eastern Europe at the expense of legitimate Soviet concerns. Greece confirms that Stalin did keep to agreements and his defenders do not see a betrayal of Yalta and Potsdam. Instead, US misunderstanding leads to criticisms about reparations, unjustified fears about the Middle East and a crisis in Berlin brought about by the currency reform. The USA, with the provocative threats of nuclear war during the Blockade, itself an offshoot of the failure to share nuclear secrets with an ally, made the USA responsible and the creation of NATO could be seen as aggressive containment.

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 assess views and counter views – the humanitarian outrages of the imposition of soviet rule in Eastern Europe, the Czech coup, the strains of the Allied control commission in Germany, Soviet espionage, the Blockade, Cominform and Comecon can all be seen as provoking a west anxious to fulfil the promises of Yalta and Potsdam. Stalin could be seen as exploiting fears – the west was not the manic and aggressive Hitler regime – with which he had actually done business in the pact of 1939. There is plenty to discuss but beware historiographical descriptions – candidates should assess the evidence and come to their own view – descriptions of 'orthodox' etc. will not rate more highly than descriptions of events unless linked to the question and evaluated. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 49	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

40 Assess the importance of Adenauer's leadership in bringing about a stable West Germany.

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. Adenauer was a conservative politician who had clear anti-Nazi credentials and who helped to found the very influential CDU in 1946, combining the old Centre Party with moderate liberals. It was clearly anti-Communist, and a credible alternative to the SPD with whom the allies could deal. He was chairman of the constituent council and helped to establish the West German Basic Law. The CDU and their Bavarian allies the CSU emerged as the largest parliamentary group in the 1949 elections and Adenauer set the pattern of coalition politics in post-war Germany by his agreement with the FDP – showing that it could work better than Weimar politics and offering dignified leadership. He worked with the allies and the FDR government, which he headed as Chancellor, got the right to conduct foreign relations in 1951. The aim was to rehabilitate Germany – and to make a fresh start. He worked with France on the Coal and Steel Community, accepted the Saar being separated and offered restitution to the Jews. He also made a defence contribution and by 1955 West Germany had its own armed forces – a measure of the trust the allies had in the new regime and how Adenauer stood as a democratic opponent to the east. The Saar was returned in 1957 and West Germany was a leading member of the EEC. Stability came not only through allied help but also through the economic prosperity promoted by Adenauer's governments and his economics minister Erhard. The state helped groups who had fled from the east and integrated former Nazis into the new state. Bourgeois stability – never a strong feature of Weimar – ensured electoral success in 1953 and 1957. In place of the pre-war instability the ruling party achieved an overall majority. The reliance on the West and the lack of interest in unification reassured Germany's defenders, but the building of the Wall shook confidence. Adenauer condemned this as he had condemned the crushing of the Berlin risings of 1953, but relations with the USA declined and Adenauer became closer to de Gaulle in 1963. The Der Spiegel affair in 1962 seemed to reveal authoritarian tendencies and Adenauer was criticised for making West Germany a 'chancellor democracy', and for not doing enough to promote unification – he rejected the Stalin Note of 1952 and aimed to integrate West Germany into Western Europe in defence and economic terms.

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 significance needs to be assessed as well as explained – better answers may feel that he was more significant in building West Germany in the period of the late-40s and mid-1950s when people still looked back at Weimar and its problems than he had become by 1963, when it was clear that new Western leaders lacked the commitment to roll back the Soviet threat and that a new approach set out in Brandt's 'Ostpolitik' was emerging. However, many may feel that Adenauer's main significance was getting the balance between democracy and order – showing that proportional representation and a federal system need not mean the instability, especially in the context of prosperity, that had been the case earlier. He was not a cabinet man – the role of the Chancellor became crucial; but his democratic credentials were sound. Better answers will do more than use this question as a peg on which to hang various explanations for the stability of West Germany. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

Page 50	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

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 51	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

41 What best explains the lack of effective opposition to either Franco in Spain or Salazar in Portugal after 1945?

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. Salazar's 'estado novo' regime continued after his death and he enjoyed a long period as prime minister from 1932 to 1968. Like Spain, the republican government which preceded his authoritarian rule was associated with unrest and divisions and even after 1945 this was a major justification for his regime. Like Franco he benefited from the Cold War – as an anti-Communist who had assisted the allied war efforts by leasing bases in the Azores and exporting minerals, his state became a member of NATO in 1949 and received Marshall Aid. Thus internal opposition got little foreign support. Salazar did not suffer until the 1960s the disgrace of colonial failures which might have provoked internal dissent. His non-doctrinaire corporativism separated him from Italian Fascism and his relations with church and army may well be the key explanation. Portugal's largely rural economy did not give rise to the leftist opposition seen in 1930s Spain and the regime seemed more like traditional Iberian catholic conservatism. The post-war era, though fairly stagnant, did see some economic growth and development and some social developments like the growth of education. The example of bitter civil war in Spain tended to discourage opposition and the political police were effective (the PVDE). Mass tourism did not affect much of Portugal in the same way as it did Spain and so encourage change. Salazar's own political skills and his careful distancing of the regime from ideology, together with the limited parliamentary tradition, may be seen as factors.

Spain's Civil war produced a lot of brutal repression of Franco's enemies which continued well into the post-war era. Despite some talk of the allies ending the regime, Spain was too important a Cold War ally and so internal unrest did not get international support. The various ethical boycotts and protests were ineffective. The regime did offer some change and modernization, especially with the investment in mass tourism. The same divisions between its internal enemies, that hindered the victory of the Republic, were present after the war. There were some nods to constitutionalism and the wise decision to appoint Juan Carlos as successor offered the hope of eventual change. Decolonisation did not provide the stimulus for change that it did in Portugal in the 70s. Franco had very strong links with the Church and the army and was no interested in a full ideological implementation of fascism. Localism tended to help the regime as his conservative supporters feared the regional disintegration threatened in the Republic and the post-war western consumer boom helped the regime in its later stages. As with Salazar, astute leadership, a certain mystique, a powerful police and repressive apparatus and an association with traditions threatened by unstable republicanism all contributed to a lack of effective 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. There should be some attempt to address the 'best' explanation of the question, rather than simply a list of reasons. The relationship between the internal and external circumstances of these countries after 1945 might offer strong analysis. A narrative answer is unlikely, but better answers may address the whole period and see some change and development in social, economic and political circumstances. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

Page 52	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

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 53	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

42 Why did the USSR have more effective control of its satellites in the period 1945 to the mid-1980s than afterwards?

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 considerable apparatus of repression developed under Stalin was applied to the satellites in various forms. The Brezhnev doctrine assumed that the Stalinist position of the USSR's vital security being linked to controlling Eastern Europe was applied vigorously. There was little chance of internal resistance being successful without western support, which was not forthcoming because of the threat of general war and the distraction of the west by other areas (Korea; Suez in 1956; Vietnam in 1968). Also having accepted the doctrine of Containment since 1947 there was little justification for dangerous intervention. The military power of the USSR was formidable well into the 1970s. The opponents within the eastern bloc were often divided and lacked essential means of support provided that the USSR kept its nerve. The leadership was not yielding and was prepared to ignore world opinion – especially as it was looking over its shoulder at China who expected clear defence of the socialist ideals. By the mid-1980s the military power of the USSR was depleted and the costs of keeping up with the West were becoming prohibitive. Afghanistan had proved impossible to control and sent a clear message to European satellites. The iron determination of the leadership had changed – Gorbachev saw less justification in an age of star wars to have the buffer states so beloved of Stalin and his heirs; economic and social discontent made it harder to control movements for change. Reform within Russia had a knock on effect on policy towards the satellites. More communication with the west had made the Berlin Wall seem anachronistic and organizations such as Solidarity were more developed than movements in Hungary in 1956 or Czechoslovakia in 1968. Mao was no longer a baleful presence and China had begun to develop since Mao's death. Massive force used against protestors in Eastern Europe did not seem a realistic option from the mid-1980s.

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. Answers may focus on the changes in the USSR, but there should, for higher levels, be some focus on the satellites and some attempt to assess factors rather than offer a series of explanations. The decisions of Khrushchev, Brezhnev and Gorbachev do have to be analysed in a wider context. Long accounts of the risings in 1956 and 1968 are not required unless they are helping to explain the difference with later events. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 54	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

43 What best accounts for the survival of parliamentary democracy in Italy after 1945?

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 may have been helped by losing the burden of colonies and ending the monarchy in 1946, as it was a break from a past associated with futile efforts at international power and a Piedmontese monarchy imposed on the different regions after 1861. The death of Mussolini and the period of suffering under German occupation gave Italy the status less of a defeated enemy than a victim. There had to be a reconstruction of political life and the emergence of the Christian Democrats under the veteran de Gasperi offered some stability. Initially the willingness to work with the Communists may have helped to establish the new Republic as politically inclusive. The support from Marshall Aid helped to rebuild Italy and her association with NATO, the EEC and the UN meant that she was integrated into international organizations. The settlement of the Trieste issue by 1954 prevented the development of extreme nationalism such as had characterized the disputes over Italia Irredenta after 1918. As with Germany, a degree of economic prosperity cushioned the new republic – though regional inequality was still a problem. Some of the achievements of the Fascist era continued and there was some land reform. In a version of *Trasformismo* the political parties showed themselves able to deal with coalitions – though the dominance of the Christian Democrats and the permanent opposition of the Communists proved divisive. However, there was no reappearance of the massive political unrest of the post-1918 era and Italian Communism was not revolutionary. The extreme right had been discredited and there was a broad democratic consensus. Unrest had grown by the 1960s, but there was some response in decentralizing policies. Some went outside conventional political discourse into terrorism; but the system broadly contained disputes. The growing economic problems imposed more pressures by the 1970s, but Italy, though faced by kidnappings, bombings and shootings was a country within the democratic framework of Western Europe and a re-emergence of dictatorship was unlikely for all the problems. The dominance of the Christian Democrats did begin to give way in the 1980s, showing that the system could adapt. However, not until 1996 was there a coalition which included the Left Democrats. The system for good or ill had marginalised the extremes while allowing for a former communist by 1998 to become prime minister.

The considerable problems of Italy – regional nationalism, crime, corruption, inflation, the gap between North and South – nevertheless did not destroy the basic system. Perhaps the lessons of the 1920s and 30s were too recent, or perhaps an underlying cynicism about political life was not joined to enthusiasm about replacing it. The greater prosperity of the 1950s, the support from the USA, the Cold War discrediting the Communist alternative and the development of Euro-Communism, participation in the EC, a flourishing cultural identity, especially in post-war cinema and social and economic reforms may have made a flawed system acceptable. Or at least made alternatives less palatable.

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 a number of factors and elements here which may be different in the early part of the period than in later post-war History. Look for evidence of analysis and discrimination rather than simply identification of a number of possible causes for higher level marks. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

Page 55	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

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 56	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

Section 9: Themes c. 1914 to 2000

44 To what extent did industrial expansion create more problems than it solved in the period 1914 to 2000?

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 problems created, candidates may look at the considerable industrial growth in Russia in the inter-war period. This meant long hours and poor conditions; it meant high levels of discipline; over-ambitious targets and possibly an increase in repression. In the industrial expansion of Nazi Germany, the four-year plans created an over-heated economy with shortages of skilled labour and possibly the need for war and expansion to create markets and to provide a use for the massive rearmament. Wartime growth in industries in the democracies caused problems when demand fell after the war and there was excessive capacity. The rapid pace of eastern bloc industrialization created problems of pollution. New industrial expansion after the war in the west meant a shift from traditional industries and old centres – new types of industry created problems of adjustment for the workforces.

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. Against the problems the industrialization did produce advantages which did solve problems – Russian industrialization solved the political problem that the Communists had taken power on behalf of the industrial workers, yet these were a minority. It also solved the problem of Russia's defence vulnerability and industrial expansion did allow survival in the war years and post-war expansion. German industrialization allowed the regime's geo-political aims to become a reality – though this in the long run created more problems. The wartime industrial expansions allowed the west to emerge victorious and post-war industrial change meant a more flexible economy. Look for the emphasis to be on problems and solutions and better answers will attempt a balanced analysis and judgement. Examples may not be the ones used here. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 57	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

45 Assess the impact of totalitarian regimes on the arts and culture of the inter-war 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. The aims of totalitarian regimes in relations to the arts – to promote support for the ideals of the regime, to condemn enemies, to promote the image of the leaders, to unite people behind internal and external struggles could be discussed. Stalin's Russia and the dictatorships of Hitler and Mussolini promoted distinctive neo-classical architecture to represent power. Artists, writers and composers were recruited to glorify the regimes to varying degrees. Candidates may also consider the negative impact – the condemnation of 'formalism' and artistic experiment in the USSR or the banning of Jewish and left wing art in Nazi Germany. Much of the art produced seemed to revert back to anodyne realism. Innovation was possible, for example in the brilliant cinema of Eisenstein and Riefenstahl and in the music of Shostakovich; but political control often stifled real creativity.

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. Answers should consider different kinds of impact and not be driven by explaining examples. There may be judgements about whether the arts were enriched by sponsorship of work which needed to touch emotions and bind people to ideals. Alternatively, there might be a view that the impact was largely negative, with experimentation discouraged and conformity enforced. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 58	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

46 How important was the Second World War in ending colonialism?

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 may be whether pre-war trends – the growth of nationalism; the weaknesses of many powers after World War One; the changing economic patterns that paved the way for an end to traditional Colonialism; or whether it was predominantly the Second World War – the humiliation of France and Great Britain and the Dutch and Americans and Portuguese at the hands of Asiatics in the Far East as Japan conquered the colonial territories of the west; the economic damage that left fewer resources available to defend colonies; the discrediting of racialism and assumptions about racial superiority; the example of British decolonization in India. There may be a counter-view that in some cases the war reaffirmed the desire to maintain colonies – this may be true of France and it was only the determined resistance of the Vietnamese and the Algerians that led to decolonisation. The war did not always weaken European resolve – as was shown by the British in Malaya and the emergence of the Cold War may have given some stiffening to colonialism as a barrier against communism.

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 (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 59	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

47 What best explains the increasing economic cooperation between states in Western Europe after 1945?

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. Post-war cooperation had its roots in wartime decisions such as the creation of UNRRA after 1943. This provided relief to liberated countries. The Bretton Woods Conference produced the IMF and World Bank and Marshall Aid involved an extensive organization. Out of a 16 nation Committee of European Economic Cooperation came the OEEC of 1948. The success of economic growth encouraged the idea of cooperation. Pan-European ideas were discussed before and during the war but circumstances encouraged their implementation after the war. Benelux had its origins in decisions taken by exiled government in 1944 and was implemented in 1946. By 1948 the three countries formed a free trade area. Britain and France signed the Dunkirk agreement in 1947 widened to include Benelux in 1948. The OEEC extended beyond the distribution of US aid to reduce tariffs and to set up a European Payments Union. Britain, Norway, Sweden and Denmark formed Uniscan in 1950 and the Scandinavian countries the Nordic Council in 1953, but the most significant development was the European Coal and Steel Community in 1952, coming out of coal and steel cooperation between France and Germany. The High Authority was a supra-national ruling body and economic unity encouraged greater interest in political unity. The Treaty of Rome in 1957 set up the EEC and in 1958 this and Euratom came into being. The key element was a common tariff policy, but also investment banks and common agricultural and transport policies. The EEC was accompanied by high growth rates among its members in the 1960s and created a market of 170 million people. Parallel to this was EFTA, set up in 1960, consisting of the 'outer 7' Britain and 6 non-EEC European countries with a population of 92 million – but this could not compete and gradually the European states came into the EEC by 1973.

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 the desire not to allow economic rivalries in Europe to provoke another war and to take measures to avoid the closed economic systems that the dictatorships instituted, which helped to lead to war. The need for cooperation was evident in the immediate needs of war-torn Europe, but there were longer term ideals and the visions of statesmen like Monnet and Schumann. The market-driven prosperity of the 1950s encouraged greater trade and development of larger markets and the decline of colonialism ended the alternatives of overseas markets. Better answers may distinguish the immediate post-war situation and developments such as Marshall Aid with the longer term developments; there may be weighing of purely economic imperatives and the need to see economic cooperation as part of a wider vision for peace in Europe and the development of wider cultural links. The answer should go beyond explaining the impact of the war on colonialism and better answers will offer a sustained judgement. The exemplification may be more diverse and there is no need to look for specific examples if the arguments are supported and illustrated. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 60	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

48 To what extent has the degree of change in the status and role of women between 1914 and 2000 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. The debate here is between the obvious increase in political equality in the sense of the franchise; the end to legal disabilities; the equal rights legislation in many countries; the emergence of women in leadership roles in the workplace, the professions and in political life and the problems that persisted in social attitudes to women, the role of women in key institutions such as the Catholic Church; the gap between pay and opportunities between men and women; the problems of combining motherhood with career development; sexual double standards and sexist attitudes in many spheres.

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 may focus on wartime changes and consider whether they extended to peace; they may look at post-war prosperity and consider its impact; they may make a distinction between western Europe and communist Europe; they may look at exploitation/collaboration under dictatorships to see if these retarded or extended the role of women, Exemplification may vary and no set material is expected. Better answers will reach a judgement by looking at both change and continuity and perhaps drawing a distinction between different areas – political and social/economic or perhaps different areas and times. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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 61	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	23

49 Assess the view that the rise in Information Technology was the greatest development in communications 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. Better answers will establish some criteria for assessing 'greatest'. Communications could include radio, TV, cinema, the press, advertising and political propaganda as well as e mail and Internet. No specific content is looked for, but arguments should be supported. IT might be seen as opening up knowledge on a massive scale and also global communication. The impact on regimes which want to control information flow has been considerable. Its impact of consumerism and buying and selling, on creating focus groups which influence all sorts of organizations, on advertising and forming public opinion, on moral standards with the huge availability of pornography, has been huge. Against this could be set the impact of other media – especially earlier in the period in which radio helped to create much greater national unity and keep people informed far better; then cinema and TV which changed cultural habits and awareness: all these had political, cultural and economic impacts.

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 possibilities of discussion are wide and exemplification will be varied; but look for more than generalisation and assertion and better answers may draw distinctions between different parts of this period and different elements of development. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

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.