

Edexcel International  
London Examinations  
GCE Ordinary Level

## Mark Scheme with Examiner's Report

# London Examinations Ordinary Level GCE in History (Syllabus B) (7262)

May/June 2001

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel International centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our International Customer Relations Unit:

Tel +44 20 7758 5656

Fax +44 20 7758 5959

[International@edexcel.org.uk](mailto:International@edexcel.org.uk)

[www.edexcel.org.uk/international](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/international)

October 2001

Order Code UO 011317

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel

Mark Scheme and Chief Examiner's Report  
May/June 2001

**HISTORY (SYLLABUS B) 7262**

---

**Mark Scheme**

Page 1 of 25

**Chief Examiner's Report**

Page 21 of 25

**Grade Boundaries**

Page 25 of 25



## HISTORY (SYLLABUS B) 7262, MARK SCHEME

---

### Section A European History, 1763-1870

#### Question 1

(a), (b) & (c) 6/8/6 inflexible

- (a) *Explain why Poland was a weak European nation in the 1770s.* (6)

Focus here is cause, and descriptions of Poland in 1760s and 1770s will earn 4 marks maximum. Concentration on cause suggests identification of long-term weakness and domination in 18th century by Austria and Prussia. Internally, noble veto on legislation restricted prospects of change, very poor condition of serfdom. Conflict over who should be King, with support for a Polish claimant. Weakness confirmed under Stanislaw Poniatowski from 1764. Poland increasingly seen as helpless pawn in European diplomacy. Both dynastic ambition and frequency of war contributed to weakness.

- (b) *Describe the stages by which Poland was partitioned in the years 1772-95.* (8)

Focus here is description, so use paragraphs 3-5 of generic marking scheme.

**1st partition (1772)** W.Prussia and Ermland went to Brandenburg-Prussia: smallest in area but well developed economically, Polish Livonia went to Russia, as did White Russia; Austria got Galicia and Lodomeria, with more than 2.5m people. Best candidates will probably wish to talk of contending territorial ambitions of the central European powers.

**2nd partition:** Bereft of means of effective defence, Great Poland becomes South Prussia in 1793. Prussia also gets Danzig and Thorn. Prussian population increased by 1m. Russia gets eastern Ukraine, Podolia and eastern Lithuania.

**3rd partition:** After Kosciuszko Polish uprising against Russia rule in Podlesia in 1794, Austria and Russia complete the disappearance of Poland as a separapaghte state. Prussia takes over Mazovia as East Prussia; Russia completes moves west, taking over remainder of Lithuania and Belorussia, western Ukraine and overlordship of Courland; Austria takes over Little Poland in 1795 and turns it into West Galicia. Despite Prussian resentment, it also took over Cracow. Reward precise information rather than generalisations.

For candidates who produce answers with substantial accurate information about territory but no sense of 'staging', maximum 6 marks. Likewise, candidates who have a sense of staging but who do not give any indication of territory which changed hands, maximum 6 marks.

Maximum of 2 marks for material on background to 1772.

- (c) *Which of the nations involved in the partitions of Poland do you consider to have gained the most from these partitions? Give reasons for your choice.* **(6)**

Focus here is historical judgement and candidates are being invited to express a view. Do not award a mark for mere 'plumping'. Reasons must be given. Look for explanations which emphasise factors such as territory gained; use made of acquisitions for diplomatic purposes or for 'great power' issues; for the second and third partitions, valid to link gains in terms of war aims. Further narrative on partitions related to one nation can be credited to a maximum of 3 marks here, unless it has been credited in earlier answers.

**Total 20 marks**

---

## **Question 2**

(a), (b) and (c), 6/8/6 inflexible

- (a) *Why was the French monarchy in crisis in the 1780s?* **(6)**

Focus is on cause, so use paragraph 8 of generic marking scheme. For description of events in France during reign of Louis XVI to 1789 maximum 4. Most candidates will discuss financial crisis, probably related to war debts (work of Calonne and Necker); weakness of Louis; divisions in society (aristocracy and bourgeoisie); challenge from enlightenment; lack of support in many sections of the army; events of 1789 leading to fall of Bastille.

- (b) *Describe how the progress of the revolution in France after the fall of the Bastille in July 1789 led to the overthrow of the monarchy in September 1792.* **(8)**

Focus is on description. Key events are fall of Bastille, attacks on aristocracy, declaration of Rights of Man, establishment of Constituent Assembly, civil constitution of clergy, Constitution of 1791, flight to Varennes, outbreak of war, Jacobin takeover in August 1792. As with all description questions, reward precision of knowledge. If answer is too restricted chronologically (say excessive concentration on 1789 or on period from Varennes to overthrow of monarch, maximum 5 marks.

- (c) *Explain why the revolution experienced a 'terror' phase in the years 1792-1794.* **(6)**

Focus is on cause. For descriptions of the terror, maximum 4 marks. Likely causal factors include dominance of the Jacobins and their power within the Assembly; effectiveness of the Committee of Public Safety; reaction to foreign threat – manipulation of patriotic response; need for economic survival – law of maximum and food rationing.

**Total 20 marks**

---

### Question 3

(a), (b) & (c), 8/6/6 inflexible

- (a) *Describe the stages by which, as a result of war, France became the dominant power in Europe in the years 1792-1807.* **(8)**

Focus is on description, so use paragraphs 3-5 of generic marking scheme. Key issues will include: power of French army, effectiveness as fighting unit in early stages; importance of Napoleon as a military genius; his increasing influence from 1796; how military strategy was put into effect. Candidates are likely to concentrate on difficulties of the allies and key military victories by the French. The most important are probably Valmy (1792), Weissenburg (1793), Lodi (1796), Pyramids (1798), Marengo (1800), Ulm & Austerlitz (1805), Jena & Auerstadt (1806), Eylau (1807). Excessive concentration on one part of the chronology (say pre- or post 1799) suggests maximum 5 marks.

Maximum of 6 marks for candidates who make no mention of territorial acquisition as key feature of increasing 'dominance'. Maximum of 6 marks for candidates who write exclusively on Napoleon, since the question begins with the beginning of the war in 1792.

- (b) *Why was France unable to sustain its earlier military successes in the years 1812-1814?* **(6)**

Focus is cause; thus further military descriptions will get 4 marks maximum. Key causal factors are: Napoleon's overstretching of the army in his Russian campaign; increasing importance of the Spanish ulcer, via the war in the Peninsula; increasing effectiveness of coalitions against France; relevant also to mention French economic overstretch. Ultimately it became very costly to continue the fight. Maximum of 3 marks for exclusive concentration on Russian Campaign.

- (c) *Explain what arrangements were made for France by the Vienna peace settlement of 1815.* **(6)**

Focus is on historical exposition. Candidates need to know the key terms of the peace treaty. There is the first treaty of Paris (1814) of course and we should allow reference to this, though certainly not require it. Key elements: France reduced to territory held in 1789; forced to pay indemnity of 700m francs; maintain army of occupation for up to five years; restoration of art treasures. Do not over-reward explanations of why France lost which are strictly irrelevant to this question.

**Total 20 marks**

#### Question 4

(a), (b) & (c), 6/8/6 inflexible

- (a) *Explain why Russia in the early nineteenth century might be considered a backward and a feudal society.* **(6)**

Focus here is on cause, but we should also reward exposition of Russia's condition in early nineteenth century. Relevant issues might include: very small extent of urban development; preservation of serfdom, poor communications across a very large country; almost religious belief in divinity of monarchy. Reward precision of material. Total concentration on serfdom suggests maximum of 3 marks.

- (b) *Describe how Alexander I and Nicholas I attempted to bring about change and domestic reform within Russia in the years 1801-1855.* **(8)**

Focus here is on description. Answers may concentrate on discretionary law to free serfs (1803); some autonomy to foreign provinces; educational reforms; codification of the law under Nicholas I, also currency reforms. Focus should properly be on change and reform but comment on repression in second half of Alexander's reign is allowable. For excessive concentration on one reign, maximum 6 marks. It is likely that more will be known on Alexander than on Nicholas.

- (c) *Why was the reign of Nicholas I also characterised by repression and defence of the old order within Russia?* **(6)**

Focus here is on cause, so descriptions of repression – including use of secret police, restriction on entry to schools, censorship – will not get beyond 4 marks. On cause, candidates are likely to concentrate on reaction to the Decembrist revolt in 1825. Importance of preserving the old order against 'dangerous' attacks from modernisers and revolutionaries.

**Total 20 marks**

---

#### Question 5

(a), (b) and (c), 6/8/6 inflexible

- (a) *Explain why nationalist feelings grew in Greece or Belgium in the early years of the nineteenth century.* **(6)**

Focus here is on cause and specific material will depend upon the option chosen. Obviously, though, candidates might discuss growing feelings of national identity and also the perceived weakness of colonial power. In case of Belgium, growing nationalist feelings in reaction to perceived dominance of Dutch after 1815. For descriptive answers, maximum 4 marks.

- (b) *Describe the involvement of the great powers in the country's struggle for independence.* **(8)**

Focus here is on description. Material again depends on selection but reward specific references rather than generalised material.



- (c) *Explain the circumstances by which the country you have chosen achieved its independence.* (6)

Focus here is on explanation of key event. The link between explanation and exposition is a fine one so allow descriptive material, particularly if it is focused squarely on the specific events in Greece in the 1820s and early 1830s and Belgium during the 1830s.

Many candidates will not separate material in (b) and (c). Standard rules apply: credit material in either sub-question, but do not credit it more than once.

**Total 20 marks**

---

### Question 6

- Describe the career of Prince Metternich, explaining his main objectives and his importance to the Austro-Hugarian empire in the years 1815-1848.* (20)

Focus here is on description and explanation. Two parts to the question and reward to maximum 12/8 marks either way. Main aims to preserve European peace, but in doing so to strengthen the existing order of kings and emperors; particularly concerned to keep Habsburg empire together; belief in legitimacy and also in intervention to help legitimate authority in trouble. On importance, relevant to mention the powers he had and the reliance of the emperor Francis I on him. Relevant also to talk about his response to growing nationalism. It is possible to argue that Metternich was of limited value, since his powers were not limitless and, arguably, he depended excessively upon short-term solutions when longer-term more radical change might have served the empire better. Obviously, candidates must be free to argue what they will, though they should back up their ideas with evidence.

**Total 20 marks**

---

### Question 7

(a), (b) and (c), 6/8/6 inflexible

- (a) *Explain how events in France in 1830 led to the overthrow of Charles X.* (6)

Focus is on historical explanation, linked to cause, so simple description will have 4 marks maximum. In part, explanation lies in response to increasingly reactionary policies of Charles X: anti-Bonapartist, growing influence of the clerics, especially Jesuits: many may concentrate on Ordinances of St Cloud, 1830, which suppressed liberties of press and reduced electorate, paving way for July Revolution. Candidates can get to maximum by using explanations derived from 1830 alone, though most will take a longer view. Reduction of monarchist army in France because of invasion of Algeria; July Days - worker and student demonstrations which the authorities could not properly suppress; nomination in Chamber of Deputies of Louis Philippe supported by Lafayette and the National Guard. Charles abdicated in favour of grandson, duc de Bordeaux, but confirmation of Louis Philippe by Chamber. Reward precise knowledge.

Maximum of 2 marks for references before 1829.

- (b) *Describe the main policies and objectives within France of Louis Philippe.* **(8)**

Focus of description. Most candidates will elide policies and objectives, but for 7 or 8 marks we must be able to distinguish between what Louis Philippe did and what the overall aims of his policies actually were. Main aims to turn France away from narrow reaction and to gain wider basis of support for regime. Wanted also to increase economic growth and improve overall living standards. Many will talk about 'liberalism' and the 'citizen king'.

- (c) *Explain why Louis Philippe was himself overthrown in 1848.* **(6)**

Focus here is on cause. Growing opposition in 1840s from socialists and also from those who wanted a different type of Bonapartism. Another cause might have been increasing political awareness of citizens, especially in towns and particularly in Paris. Failure of foreign policy also a factor (though narrative of foreign policy should have 3 marks maximum).

**Total 20 marks**

---

### Question 8

(a), (b) and (c), 6/8/6 inflexible

- (a) *Explain how the weakness of the Ottoman Empire contributed to the outbreak of war in the Crimea in 1854.* **(6)**

Focus here is on historical explanation, linked to cause. It is reasonable to provide an explanation of the circumstances which led to war. Here the main factors will include: Russian resentment at Convention of Straits (1841) which lost it its privileged position in Mediterranean; Russian support for Orthodox Christians in Turkish empire and hope for Austrian support in SE Europe; Turkish resistance to Russian demands in 1853, supported by Britain; Britain's growing resentment of Russian expansionism; invasion Moldavia and Wallachia by Russia in 1853; Anglo-French alliance 1854.

To get 5 or 6 marks, candidates must link this clearly with explanation of how Turkish weaknesses provided a springboard for so much else.

- (b) *Describe the key features of the Crimean War (1854-1856), explaining why Russia lost the war.* **(8)**

Two parts to this question: description of war and causes of Russia's defeat. Key features are: war in Danube area, leading to Russian withdrawal; war in Crimea, battle of Alma and stalemate in attempt by allies to capture naval base at Sebastopol; Charge of the Light Brigade (Battle of Balaclava), then Battle of Inkerman. Reasons for defeat of Russia will include British and French combined strength (despite many mistakes), intervention of Piedmont. Strain of war on Russian economy. Best candidate might even query whether Russia lost rather than deciding to go for piece. However, eventually, Russians did evacuate Sebastopol.

- (c) *Why did the Treaty of Paris, which ended the war, fail to resolve the tensions which were involved in the Eastern Question?* **(6)**

Best candidates can skirt lightly over the terms of the treaty (demilitarisation of Black Sea; restoration of territory to Turks; guarantees to territorial integrity to Turkish empire; regulation of maritime warfare). Description of the terms can get to maximum 3 marks. Beyond this, candidates should explain why this was not a lasting settlement: continued weakness of Turkish empire and renewed opportunity for Russians to increase their influence in south-east Europe are likely to feature strongly.

**Total 20 marks**

---

### **Question 9**

(a) & (b), 6/14 inflexible

- (a) *What factors in the years 1815-1848 favoured the development of a movement for the unification of Germany?* **(6)**

Focus here is on historical exposition of key issue. Candidates may well note lack of unity in 1815, with more than 300 states and few natural ties to bind them, though some nationalist writers developed the theme. The role of the Confederation which provided some stability; economic intervention leading to Zollverein which boosted moves towards unity; building of railways; socialism and concern with 'the social question' as a unifying force for some. Question says 'what' not 'how much' so maximum may be achieved by accumulating list of favourable factors.

- (b) *Describe the policies employed by Otto Von Bismarck in the 1860s to achieve the unification of Germany.* **(14)**

Focus here is on description. However, the question is concerned with unification, so do not over-reward material which is purely on the career of Bismarck, unless related to the unification. Key issues will include: Bismarck's keeping Prussia at the centre of German unification issue; isolating Austria and denying it opportunity to assert leadership in any confederation; Schleswig – Holstein question and how it helped Prussia to be associated with German nationalism; Austro Prussian war; North German Confederation in 1867; Franco-Prussian war and how it harnessed German nationalism. There are many factors in play. Thus, for excessive concentration on one key factor (for example, Austro-Prussian war) maximum 6 marks.

**Total 20 marks**

---

## Question 10

(a), (b) & (c) 6/8/6 inflexible

- (a) *Describe the stages by which Louis Napoleon increased his position within France in the years 1848-1852.* **(6)**

Focus is on causes of Louis Napoleon's growing influence and popularity so maximum of 4 marks for description of events in these years which does not show how they helped strengthen his position. Reasons include: support from businessmen, scared of socialism; support from Church; exploitation of national 'name' and cultivation of public opinion as a man above factions. Importance of his *coup* in 1851 and the Plebiscite. In 1852, development of new Constitution; change from Prince President for 10 years to assumption of Imperial title, again ratified by plebiscite. Then attack on opposition: imposition of censorship; suppression of political clubs; control of state education. Chronology should be precise here. Do not reward material outside this period.

- (b) *How, through his domestic policies, did Napoleon III seek to make himself both popular and respected within France after 1852?* **(8)**

Focus here is on exposition. Relevant factors include: Napoleon's concern for welfare of people and his belief in state intervention; economic policies including better credit system, free trade, better communications, especially railways; compulsory elementary education from 1863; rebuilding of Paris, which 40,000 new houses built; symbolic importance of the Paris Exhibition of 1867. Candidates can get to 6 marks without explicit comment on both popular and respected but best candidates should attempt to indicate how policies were angled at both. Mere description of what Napoleon did should receive maximum of 5 marks.

- (c) *Explain how the foreign policy of Napoleon III contributed first to his increasing unpopularity and then to his downfall by 1870.* **(6)**

Focus here is on explanation of key factors of foreign policy. Candidates are likely to concentrate on the lack of success in foreign policy, especially in Mexico, 1861-7 and then isolation in diplomacy before disastrous Franco-Prussian war, for which France was not adequately prepared. Good candidates might also note how Napoleon's diplomacy failed to prevent increasing Prussian influence before the war of 1870. Rapid defeat in this war led to bloodless coup and Napoleon's flight to Britain. Description of foreign policy unlinked to unpopularity and downfall, maximum 4 marks. Similarly, explanation focus without any reference to ultimate downfall, maximum 5 marks.

**Total 20 marks**

## Question 11

- (a) *What can you tell from Map A about the political situation of Italy in 1815?* **(3)**

Target: Inference from presented representational source.

- L1: Basic statements showing some understanding that Italy was divided. **1**
- L2: Developed statements which show inferential skills. Candidate shows clear understanding of the nature of divisions which may be linked to the lack of independence. Map provides clear evidence that the smaller states are mostly in the north. Allow candidates to use their knowledge that Austrian Empire (shown on the map) was the dominant influence in Italy in 1815 but maximum marks should be awarded to candidates who clearly use the map to its fullest effect. **2-3**

- (b) *What evidence from Extract B supports the evidence of the Map A about the political situation of Italy before 1850?* **(4)**

Target: Cross reference from two presented sources.

- L1: Basic statements giving general understanding about foreign influence in Italy. **1-2**
- L2: Developed statements from the Extract which are cross-referred to material from the map. Thus, candidates may make use of the map to talk about size of Italy and communications. This can be cross-referred to Extract B. The map can also be used to provide evidence of the 'local' interests to which Cavour refers. **2-4**

- (c) *What, according to Cavour (Extract B), are the main causes of Italy's troubles, and why might the coming of the railways help to reduce these troubles?* **(4)**

Target: Comprehension and inference.

- L1: Basic statements on both causes and the importance of railways, or developed statements about one. Excessive 'lifting' from the source rather than having the material rendered in own words suggests Level 1. **1-2**
- L2: Developed statements about both causes of Italy's troubles and the importance of the railways in reducing or removing them. Will get both foreign influence and internal division from the source. Railways will remove some of this hostility by bringing 'Italians' from different parts of the Peninsula together. For maximum, look for confident use of source to produce appropriate response concentrating on exposition of weaknesses and on cause. **3-4**

- (d) *How, in the years 1850-1870, were the Italians able to remove the obstacles referred to by Cavour in Extract B?* **(9)**

Target: Description of key features of events involved in Italian Unification.

Use paragraphs 3-5 of generic marking scheme. Emphasis in good answers should be on precise detail which includes strong awareness of the relevant chronology. Emphasis should be on growth of national identity; the role of Piedmont and Cavour; role of French intervention and the events of 1858; role of Garibaldi; bringing Venetia and Rome into the United Nation in 1870. Answers which end in 1861 should not go beyond 7 marks. Best candidates might wish to weigh the respective importance of the various factors they identify but this is not necessary for maximum marks.

**Total 20 marks**

---

## Question 12

(a), (b) & (c) 4/2/14 inflexible

- (a) *Explain what is meant by the term 'romantic'.* **(4)**

L1: Shows basic understanding of the term, *e.g.* makes reference to emphasis on feelings and expression. **1-2**

L2: Provides developed understanding in context, *e.g.* emphasises feelings and expression but is able to make some reference to how the movement is different, as for example as reaction against constraints of classicism. Reward any valid contextualisation and/or development **3-4**

- (b) *Name two pieces either of literature or of music written or composed in the period 1815-1870 which might be considered to be romantic.* **(2)**

One mark each for accurate identification. Though technically, both pieces have to be in the same form, allow one accurate identification in each mode.

- (c) *For both of the pieces you have chosen, explain their main characteristics and why they deserve to be called romantic.* **(14)**

Content obviously depends upon who is selected. Expect reference relevant to the works mentioned. Examples might include: Schiller's emphasis on national feelings; Wordsworth's nature poems; Beethoven's Pastoral symphony; any pieces by Chopin, Mendelssohn, Schubert or Schumann (and the list is not exhaustive). For each work appropriately selected, maximum of 8 marks. Within the overall maximum, up to 6 on either side (characteristics and justification of 'romantic').

**Total 20 marks**

---

## Section B European History, 1870-1989

### Question 13

(a), (b) & (c) 6/8/6 inflexible

- (a) *Describe the key features of the constitution of Imperial Germany when it was created in 1871.* **(6)**

Focus here is on explanation of key elements of Constitution. Some candidates might note that this is an adaptation of the North German Confederation. Kaiser retained considerable political power. He could appoint Chancellor himself. Could veto legislation and dissolve Reichstag Legislature in two houses: Bundesrat (upper) Reichstag (lower) – elected for five years on manhood suffrage. Bundesrat took policy initiatives. Reward precise statements concerning the constitution.

- (b) *What were the main domestic challenges which faced Bismarck and the government of Germany in the years 1871-1890?* **(8)**

Focus is on exposition of challenges. The main ones likely to be identified are: from large Catholic minority (Bismarck's Kulturkampf and anti-Catholic legislation; Falk laws) and from Socialists (their increasingly Marxist orientation from mid-1870s) – Bismarck attacked it with censorship of newspapers and Exceptional Law. Response to socialist challenge also in social welfare legislation. Some candidates will also mention challenge of national minorities (especially Polish and Danish) and Germanisation policy. It is not necessary to develop Bismarck's response to the challenges (see (c), though many will do this anyway, thus overlapping into the next sub-question. This is allowable, though do not credit same material twice. Excessive concentration on one major challenge, (e.g. Kulturkampf alone) maximum 4 marks.

- (c) *How successfully do you think that Bismarck and the government met its domestic challenges in these years?* **(6)**

Focus here is on historical judgement. Maximum 3 marks for factual material not previously used and not linked to evaluation of success. Most candidates will want to argue that Bismarck had greater success in combating socialist challenge than in dealing with Catholics, since most discriminatory legislation disappeared in 1880s. Welfare legislation generally considered a success.

**Total 20 marks**

### Question 14

*Explain the importance of three of the following in the history of the Third Republic in France in the years 1870-1914.* **(20)**

*Adolphe Thiers;  
The Constitution of 1875;  
Léon Gambetta;  
Anti-clericalism;  
General George Boulanger;  
The Panama Scandal;  
The Dreyfus Affair.*

Material depends on which three individuals or features are chosen. For each one, a maximum of 8 marks. Within this, maximum of 5 for mere description. To go beyond this, candidates must explicitly deal with their importance. Most candidates at this level will say why the event or individual was significant and/or how it changed things in or for France.

**Total 20 marks**

---

### Question 15

(a), (b) & (c) 6/6/8 inflexible

(a) *Why did the great powers of Europe develop alliance systems in the years before 1914?* **(6)**

Focus here is on cause, so maximum of 4 marks for description of the key alliances. Also, if material on alliances is included here it should not be credited on repetition in part (b). Key causal elements are likely to be: growing rivalry between powers; competition over scarce resources, which is a factor in imperial rivalry; fear of German isolation; fear by many other powers of growing German influence and military aggression; need for alliances in order to avoid isolation.

(b) *Describe the stages by which rivalry between Great Britain and Germany grew in the years 1899-1911.* **(6)**

Focus here is on description, so reward precise material which shows how rivalry grew. Candidates are likely to concentrate on factors such as: imperial rivalry in Africa; German anti-British attitudes during Boer War; the significance of the Algeiras Conference when Britain determined not to return to isolation - linked to Anglo-French *ententes* and growing fear in Germany of isolation; Anglo-German naval rivalry (Dreadnought issue, particularly); Agadir and the so-called Second Morocco crisis 1911 – this accelerated Anglo-French co-operation.



- (c) *Explain how conflict in the Balkans in the years 1912-14 resulted in the outbreak of a world war.* **(8)**

Focus here is on historical judgement, linked to cause. Use paragraph 8 of generic marking scheme. Description of events in the Balkans can get to 5 marks but the remaining marks need to be earned by relating highly specific material from south-east Europe to the wider issue of European conflict. Candidates must stick to the chronology. Careful linkage will be necessary to make pre-1912 material relevant, beyond a general introduction about instability and weakness of the Ottoman empire exploited by nationalist forces. Key material will concern Balkan War 1912-13 and Russian support for Serbia against Austria; Serbia's war with Bulgaria in 1913; assassination of Franz Ferdinand and the train of events which led to outbreak of war largely because of existing treaty obligations signed by the powers earlier; war brought about by timetables – Schlieffen plan required speedy execution to enable Germany to move against Russia. Excessive concentration on general context, with little or no knowledge of Balkans suggests maximum of 3 marks.

Maximum of 4 marks for total concentration on the assassination at Sarajevo and its aftermath.

**Total 20 marks**

---

### Question 16

- (a) *What, according to Extract B, was the Provisional Government's attitude towards the world war? Explain your reference with reference to the extract.* **(3)**

Target: Comprehension from presented source.

L1: Basic statements showing some understanding of Provisional Government's attitude – it was in favour of keeping on with the war. Excessive 'lifting' without explanation suggests L1. **1**

L2: Developed statements showing clear understanding of Provisional Government's attitude. Will understand that it was in favour of the war and would maintain its treaty obligations. Overall understanding will be shown by ability to use passage to present a clear statement about attitude. **2-3**

- (b) *What can you learn from Photograph A about support for revolution in Moscow in February 1917? Explain your answer.* **(3)**

Target: Inference from presented visual source.

L1: Basic statements giving general understanding about the message given by the photograph. Will see that people are taking newspapers from the soldier. **1**

L2: Developed statements about the message of the photograph. Will be able to infer that the photograph suggests enthusiastic welcome of the soldier's message as conveyed through the newspaper. May well pick up evidence of facial expressions which support the idea of welcome for revolutionary ideas. Candidates at this level should also notice both civilian and at least some military support for revolution. **2-3**

- (c) *How much reliance should a historian place on Photograph A and Extract B as evidence about popular attitudes in Russia in early 1917 towards both revolution and towards 'the world war'?* **(4)**

Target: Evaluation of reliability of two sources.

L1: Basic statements about reliability of the two sources. e.g. simple statement that the photograph will give a 'real' picture while the speech is arguing that the war should continue. Provenance may be transcribed literally. Candidates might also say that both sources were produced at the time and therefore 'reliable'. Alternatively, a developed statement about one source only may be made. Candidates may make simple generic statements, e.g. about a photograph not 'lying'. **1-2**

L2: Developed statements about reliability of both sources. Candidates at this level should be able to discuss reliability in context of the messages conveyed by the sources (e.g. photograph shows enthusiastic welcome but may have been used as propaganda to imply greater overall enthusiasm than was the case. Similarly, the speech will probably be accurate as a speech but it can't be taken as reliable evidence that its audience were persuaded. It does not matter whether candidates argue that the sources are, or are not, reliable so long as they set up considered criteria for judging the grounds on which they might be so considered. Do not expect fine-grained reliability comment on both sources for maximum marks. It is sufficient that candidates have reflected on issues relating to reliability in the context of the two sources. **3-4**

- (d) *Describe the course of the revolution in Russia during 1917, explaining why the Bolsheviks were able to seize power in October/November of that year.* **(10)**

Target: Description of key features of revolutionary events in Russia.

Use paragraphs 3-5 of generic marking scheme. Emphasis in good answers should be on precise detail which include adherence to the precise chronology. Emphasis should be on events leading up to the overthrow of the Tsar, then on the Provisional Government and its attempts to establish order and viable government, the challenges it faced and then the attack on the Government by the Bolsheviks. Candidates should not be rewarded for material which goes back significantly before 1917 (although the context of a war-torn economy and military defeat may be used) or on into the Civil War or the policies of Lenin from 1918 onwards.

Excessive concentration on one of the two revolutions (almost certainly the Bolshevik), award a maximum of 7 marks.

**Total 20 marks**

### Question 17

(a), (b) & (c) 8/6/6 inflexible

- (a) *Describe the main terms of the peace settlements of 1919 as they affected Germany and the Austro-Hungarian Empire.* **(8)**

Focus here is on historical description. Use paragraphs 3-5 of the generic mark scheme. Candidates should concentrate on the Treaties of Versailles (Germany) and St Germain & Trianon (Austria & Hungary respectively). Main emphasis should be harsh terms, including loss of territory and reparations. It is likely that much more will be known on treaty affecting Germany and maximum 6 marks for candidates who provide exclusive commentary on Versailles.

- (b) *Explain why the terms of the Treaty of Versailles were so harsh towards Germany.* **(6)**

Focus here is on cause. Do not reward material already provided in answer to (a). Use paragraph 8 of generic mark scheme. Candidates should concentrate on devastation of the war, feeling that Germany had been to blame and widespread desire for revenge by statesmen on behalf of their people.

- (c) *On what grounds, in the early 1920s, was the Treaty of Versailles so heavily criticised?* **(6)**

Focus here is on historical exposition. Candidates can concentrate either on criticism from within Germany (which concentrated on excessive harshness and devastating economic consequences of reparations) or from outside. From outside Germany, increasing recognition that harsh terms were producing destabilising consequences throughout Europe and might aid extremist parties.

**Total 20 marks**

---

### Question 18

(a), (b) & (c) 6/8/6 inflexible

- (a) *What were Benito Mussolini's main foreign policy objectives in the years 1922-1939?* **(6)**

Focus here is on historical exposition. See generic mark scheme paragraphs 3-5. Relevant to mention expansionist aims and attempting to make Italy a great power recognised as such by other nations.

- (b) *Describe how Mussolini's policies in the 1930s brought him into conflict with the League of Nations.* **(8)**

Focus here is historical exposition. Most candidates will describe the Abyssinian crisis and the UN reaction. Candidates can be allowed to produce their expositions of how the crisis resolved itself but there should be precise knowledge of both Italian aggression and how the League responded to what it saw as a threat.

- (c) *Do you think that Mussolini had increased Italy's influence in world affairs by 1939?* **(6)**

Focus here is historical judgement. For further description of Mussolini's foreign policies, maximum 4 marks but do not credit material already rewarded in (a) and (b). Evaluation must be on extent to which Italy had increased its influence. Relevant to mention how far relations with Germany, the Abyssinian crisis and involvement in the Spanish civil war did increase influence. It is possible to argue that, by 1939 if not earlier, Mussolini was widely seen as excessively dominated by Hitler.

**Total 20 marks**

---

### **Question 19**

*Describe the domestic policies of Josef Stalin within the USSR in the years 1928-1941, explaining how successful you consider them to have been.*

This question is in two parts. Allow 14/6 marks either way, since few candidates are likely to be able to sustain an answer to the same length concerning judgements on 'how successful'. In the first part, candidates are likely to write about policies designed to modernise the USSR (including collectivisation) and the increasing control exercised by Stalin over the USSR (including the Purges). Reward candidates who can range across the period and who can provide precise material.

Within the description section, no reference to one of industrialisation, agricultural policy or Purges, only award a maximum of 10 marks out of the 14 available.

**Total 20 marks**

---

### **Question 20**

(a), (b) & (c) 6/6/8 inflexible

- (a) *Explain how Hitler and the Nazis were able to achieve power in Germany in the years 1929-1933.* **(6)**

Focus here is on description. Reward answers which are both precise and stick to the chronology, which is tight. There is, of course, much to go at including: economic depression; impact of unemployment; rising fortunes of Nazis in elections, especially 1930 and 1932; how Nazis used fear of Communism; attempt by established politicians (von Schleicher and von Papen) to neuter Hitler's impact by including him within existing structure. If explanation of why Nazis came to power is on offer, it can be rewarded but is not necessary for maximum marks here, since causation is only implicit.

Do not credit descriptive material pre-1929, which fails to make a link to Nazi achievement of power.

- (b) *Describe the ways in which Hitler and the Nazis increased their power within Germany in the years 1933-1935?* **(6)**

Focus here is on understanding key features of Nazi consolidation of power. The emphasis must be on growing power within. Key points are Enabling Law (1933) suspending constitution; abolition of opposition parties; centralisation of power in local as well as central government; control of trade unions; impact of Night of Long Knives (1934); Hitler as President from 1934; increased Nazi control over the Army. Use paragraphs 3-5 of generic marking scheme.

- (c) *Do you think that the domestic policies of Hitler and the Nazis brought more benefits than disadvantages to the citizens of Germany in the years 1933-1939? Explain the basis of your answer.* **(8)**

Focus here is on historical judgement. Use paragraph 8 of generic mark scheme. For description of what the Nazis did in domestic policy maximum of 5 marks. On benefits, candidates are likely to talk of moving out of depression and lowering unemployment. On the other side, there is the lack of representation, increasing brutality to opponents and persecution of identified minorities.

**Total 20 marks**

---

### **Question 21**

(a), (b) & (c) 6/8/6 inflexible

- (a) *Why did Germany achieve so many military and strategic successes in the early stages of the Second World War (1939-1941)?* **(6)**

Focus is on cause. Description of relevant events in 1939-41 should have maximum of 4 marks. Key factors are: Blitzkrieg tactics; speed of German movement; working to an identified plan. Lack of direct support for Europeans from USA. Use paragraph 8 of generic mark scheme.

- (b) *Describe the main stages of the Second World War in Europe in the years 1942-1945.* **(8)**

Focus here is on description of key events in the second stage of the war when Germany is increasingly on the defensive. Relevant to mention Germany's failures in Russia; allies conquest of Italy; D-Day and the liberation of France; final push on Germany from west and East. As always, reward precise information. Material outside Europe cannot be credited in this question.

- (c) *How important was the direct involvement of the United States in the war in Europe to securing the victory of the Allies by 1945?* **(6)**

Focus here is on historical judgement. For description of US involvement maximum 4 marks. Candidates can of course argue as they wish, but better answers will select information effectively to buttress a case.

**Total 20 marks**

---

## Question 22

(a), (b) & (c), 6/8/6 inflexible

- (a) *What arrangements were made by the Allies in 1945 for the future of Germany?* **(6)**

Focus here is on exposition of key terms in the peace treaty. Candidates should know that Germany was disarmed in 1945 and Germany divided into four occupation zones shared between the main allies. Specific division into West and East Germany. Thorough democratisation in West was also introduced as part of the attempt to denazify the Germany and therefore, so the argument went, to prepare it for economic development and worthiness to be admitted back into the ranks of civilised nations.

- (b) *What roles were played by Konrad Adenauer and Ludwig Erhard in the development of Germany in the 1950s and 1960s?* **(8)**

Focus here is on evaluation of roles of key individuals. Description of the careers of the two politicians can get to 5 marks maximum. Beyond this there must be explicit links to the issue of West Germany's development. Candidates should know about Adenauer's role as first Chancellor of the post-war German republic. He negotiated German entry into NATO. Erhard is best known for his economic policies and for his superintendence of the 'German economic miracle'.

- (c) *Why did Germany recover its prosperity so quickly in the thirty years after the end of the Second World War?* **(6)**

Focus here is on cause, so use paragraph 8 of the generic section of the mark scheme. What candidates believe is most important is of course a matter of their judgement but likely explanations will include: the almost forcible push to democracy and the need to rebuild a shattered and war-torn economy; involvement of Germany in EEC from inception; determination in both US and Europe that risks of new war should be minimised, though aid to Germany to act as buffer against eastern-bloc expansionism.

Best candidates should explicitly comment on 'so quickly' but since this requires quite sophisticated analytical skills, it is possible to get maximum of 5 marks by listing causes of German recovery.

**Total 20 marks**

---

## Question 23

(a), (b) & (c) 8/6/6 inflexible

- (a) *Describe the main domestic policies and objectives of Josef Tito as ruler of Yugoslavia in the years 1945-1975.* **(8)**

Focus is on description. Most candidates will not separate policies and objectives, but they should recognise that Tito aimed to avoid excessive USSR involvement in Yugoslavia's development.

- (b) *Explain how Tito managed to resist pressure from the Soviet Union for closer ties with the Soviet Bloc.* **(6)**

Target here is explanation (see paragraph 8 of generic mark scheme) so emphasis should be on Tito's strategy. Reference might be made to Tito's relations with the west, with how he used his personal power, the relative economic independence of Yugoslavia (partly helped by tourist boom from 1960s). Also relevant to mention Soviet Bloc's feeling that Yugoslavia was less central to his defensive 'shield' than other 'satellites'. For pure account of Tito's policies, unlinked to this pressure, maximum 4.

- (c) *Why did Yugoslavia slide into disunity and crisis after the death of Tito?* **(6)**

Focus here is on cause, so use paragraph 8 of generic mark scheme. Many candidates will talk of Tito's personal qualities and also the religious and nationalist divisions within Yugoslavia which made long-term retention of a Yugoslav national identity problematic. Also, important to note the self-interest of some leaders, perhaps especially in Serbia, and objective in certain states to establish overall dominance in the area.

**Total 20 marks**

---

### Question 24

(a), (b) and (c) 4/8/8 inflexible

- (a) *What is meant by the term 'European integration'?* **(4)**

L1: Basic definition of term: anything which implies bringing states closer together. **1-2**

L2: Developed explanation of term which shows what it means and locates this in particular context. Here the most likely context lies in moves to bring nations of the EU closer together, for example in law, social chapter, etc. **3-4**

- (b) *Why did many members of the EEC (Common Market) in the years from 1957 to 1990 think that the community needed greater European integration?* **(8)**

Focus here is on cause so descriptions of what happened in terms of European policy in the relevant period will have maximum of 5 marks. Most candidates are likely to talk of perceived advantages of harmonisation in terms of free trade, equal opportunities under law, emergence of Europe as one of the world's most important markets, etc.

- (c) *Describe the main policies followed by the EEC after 1957 in order to achieve greater integration. Why did many citizens in the member states oppose these policies?* **(8)**

Two parts to this question, one requiring description of policies and the other targeted on cause. Mark at maximum of 5/3 marks either way. On 'why' many citizens feared greater powers of a European superstate and were concerned about withering of national identities and even independence. In 1960s, many of the EEC states felt that greater integration was the most secure route to lasting peace since it would bury lingering post-war resentments.

**Total 20 marks**

---



# **HISTORY (SYLLABUS B) 7262, CHIEF EXAMINER'S REPORT**

---

## **General Comments**

The examiners were happy to report a considerable improvement in the standards achieved by candidates in 2001 compared with those of 2000. The improvement may be attributed to two main factors. Firstly, the number of candidates increased by almost twenty per cent this year and many were in Centres which produced some strong performances. The second factor was the question paper itself. Examiners have for some years noted the strong preference of candidates to answer questions in Section A (European History to 1870) rather than Section B (1870-1989). Within Section A, however, it becomes increasingly clear that candidates are looking for certain topics for which they tend to be extremely well prepared. One of these is the Partitions of Poland and another Restoration France, at least to 1830. When these questions appear in accessible form, there are strong performances. This year, Question 1 (on the Partitions) and Question 7 (on France from 1815-48) proved, by some distance, to be the most popular questions on the paper, answered by 75-80% of all candidates. These questions also scored highly.

The disproportionate strength of candidates in certain areas presents the examiners with a difficulty. On the one hand, the examiners wish to produce a paper which gives candidates good opportunities for showing what they know, understand and can do. On the other, the examiners cannot set the same topics year on year, for fear both of eliciting unreflective and stereotyped answers and also of ignoring themes of equal substance and centrality about which candidates may know less. Thus, while the examiners were delighted with the overall performance this year and wish to congratulate both teachers and candidates on their hard work, they must point out that they cannot expect questions on the Partitions of Poland every year. In late eighteenth-century Europe, for example, historians would judge the development of what has come to be known as 'Enlightened Despotism' as having at least equal importance.

---

## **Question 1**

Question 1 scored more highly than any other on the paper. Levels of knowledge on parts (a) and (b) were very high. Frankly, the examiners were surprised and impressed by how much many of the candidates knew about which precise territories were acquired by the various states in 1772, 1793 and 1795. They were delighted to be able to award a number of maximum marks for 1(b). In 1(a) some marks were lost by candidates who produced lengthy narratives going back to the early 1760s which failed to reach conclusions about why Poland was a weak European state. Nevertheless, a number of maximum mark scores were achieved here also. The sub-question which gave more problems was 1c in which too few candidates could produce a reasoned judgment on which power gained the most. Many just plumped for Russia (or, sometimes, Prussia or Austria) without explaining how their gains benefited them particularly.

## Question 2

A number of candidates tackled Question 2 and answers were very variable. Some answered all parts expertly but the cause focus in both (a) and (c) proved a substantial hurdle for many. Weak candidates tended to write indiscriminately. Many in (a) wrote at length about the condition of the peasantry without linking this to the crisis of the French monarchy. In (b), the fall of the Bastille occupied too large a place in a question which continued to 1792 and in (c) few explained why The Terror occurred, preferring to produce a narrative of 1792-4. For many, the details of these crowded years proved a substantial hurdle.

---

## Question 3

Answers to Question 3 were likewise variable in quality. Some were excellent in all three parts, providing both precise detail and a good attention to the focus of the question. Among weaker candidates, the main difficulties were lack of knowledge of events before Napoleon's rise to power and a tendency to write indiscriminately about the terms of the peace settlement in 1815, rather than on its treatment of France.

---

## Question 4

Question 4 was attempted by few and responses were rarely strong. Clearly, Nicholas I's reign is not well known and very few scored highly on question (c). Question (a) should have been straightforward but its conceptual demands clearly confused many, who found matching their knowledge to understanding of a 'feudal society' very difficult. A few candidates wrote about Alexander II rather than Alexander I.

---

## Question 5

More than three quarters of all candidates attempted Question 5, making it the most popular on the paper. About two thirds of those attempting it wrote on Belgium and many maximum marks were scored on part (a). It proved slightly more difficult to pull material together in the option on Greece but a number of high marks were scored here also. Less able candidates tended to find difficulty with questions (b) and (c), and not because they lacked knowledge. Many had this in copious quantities. Rather they failed to understand the difference between 'explaining' how the country achieved its independence and 'describing' the role or involvement of the great powers in this process. As a consequence, many produced the same material in both answers. In the Belgian option, also, candidates had difficulty sustaining the story throughout the period 1830-39.

---

## Question 6

Question 6 was not popular and was adequately managed by those who attempted it. Few candidates could produce answers which covered the whole period 1815-48, many concentrating excessively on the years immediately after the end of the French wars. Outline understanding of Metternich's conservative cast of mind and his policies designed to combat the spread of nationalism was, however, widely present.

---

### **Question 7**

Question 7 was popular and variably done. A few candidates had excellent knowledge of the reigns of all three monarchs; they tended to score very highly, not least because part (c) gave them an opportunity to demonstrate understanding of the fragility of Louis Philippe's regime when faced with a major challenge. The main problem, however, was that relatively few candidates were as well informed about Louis Philippe as they were about Charles X. In consequence, some candidates obtained almost all their marks on part (a), where many maximum marks were scored. Domestic policy in the reign of Louis Philippe was not well known.

---

### **Question 8**

Question 8 also tended to produce unbalanced answers. Many candidates knew why the Crimean War broke out and some very precise detail was on offer. However, too little of this was angled towards the issue of Turkish weakness. In consequence, many candidates scored up to 4 out of the 6 marks in part (a) but could not get beyond this. Knowledge of the battles in the Crimean War was not extensive, which is perhaps strange since it is widely available in standard texts. Part (c) produced some weak responses with little specific explanation. Few candidates had either the ability or the confidence to reflect on how, and why, the Peace of Paris left the key issues of power politics in south-eastern Europe unresolved.

---

### **Question 9**

Question 9 was answered by about one third of candidates and produced much higher than average scores. The description focus for part (b) was widely welcomed since many candidates clearly have extensive, precise knowledge about Bismarck's policies in the 1860s. Part (a), which carried far fewer marks, saw too many general responses with specific information only on the Zollverein.

---

### **Question 10**

Question 10 also produced some strong responses. Some candidates were able to score maximum marks on both (a) and (b) because their knowledge was extensive and appropriately selected. More, however, lacked detail on the period 1848-51 and answered more confidently on part (b). Question (c) presented more of a challenge. Candidates often lacked specific information on Napoleon III's foreign policy, except for some references to Italian Unification. Even those who had this material made only simple comments about the link between foreign policy failures and the weakening of Napoleon's domestic position.

---

### **Question 11**

In chronological sequence, Question 11 was the last to attract significant numbers of candidates. It performed well and the examiners are pleased to see a gradual improvement in the deployment of the evidence skills needed to tackle this question. Question 11 (a) elicited a large number of maximum scores. The examiners regret that some information about the Austrian Empire's territories in Italy was inadvertently left off the map but this error advantaged candidates since it thereby became easier to

secure maximum marks by indicating that the map showed fragmentation and giving one or two examples. In (b), many candidates could cross-refer happily between Cavour's statements on foreign influence and the evidence of the map; again many marks of three or four were awarded. Although some candidates did not really understand Cavour's argument about communication difficulties impeding the development of nationalism, many found the comprehension exercise which part (c) offered perfectly manageable. Thus, by the time they reached the higher-tariff final question a number of candidates had scored between 7 and 9 marks. Answers to d) discriminated well enough. A lot of candidates had little or nothing to say after 1861 and some produced excessive narrative on the events of 1858-61. Along with questions 1 and 9, this proved to be one of the highest-scoring questions on the paper.

---

### **Question 12**

The examiners saw a few responses to Question 12 but almost without exception they were very weak. Commonly, they were awarded marks between 0 and 5. The topic of Romanticism is clearly not widely taught. Some candidates who clearly did not have a fifth answer to present tried to get by on the broadest, and in some cases, the wildest of generalisations.

---

### **Questions 13-24**

None of the other questions on the paper were answered by more than 9% of candidates and some, notably Questions 18 (on Mussolini) and 22-24 (on Europe after 1945) were virtually ignored. The pattern of answers contrasts most sharply with that on the sister syllabus 7263 (Modern World History) where questions on Europe (and particularly on Germany, Russia and Italy between the wars) are almost always among the most popular on the paper. In this Paper, therefore, comment on questions in Section B of the paper can be brief. Those wishing to read more detailed comments on performance by candidates entered for identical questions on Syllabus 7263 should look in that report. Questions 16-22 also appeared on Section C of that syllabus. Teachers should be aware, however, that, in general, candidates entered for Syllabus 7263 produced stronger answers to these questions than did those entered for this Syllabus.

The question on this section which was most popular was Question 16, the documents-based question. In contrast to candidates on Syllabus 7263, however, answers tended to be weak. Candidates often failed to understand the purpose of 16 (c), which was targeted on the reliability of two contrasting pieces of historical evidence, and many failed to score. Also, knowledge of the events which took place in Russia during 1917 were not known in sufficient detail.

The small number of candidates answering Question 13 were often well informed on Bismarck's domestic policies. However, answers tended to be weak in detail on the constitution of Imperial Germany. Some candidates failed to understand the different foci of questions (b) and (c) and found themselves repeating material.

A few answers were seen to Question 14 and some of them were strong. The options chosen were almost invariably Boulanger, Panama and Dreyfus. Among the small number of responses to Question 15 a pattern emerged. Candidates tended to understand the reasons for the development of alliance systems and to understand something about the significance of the crises in the Balkans from 1912. However, almost no candidates showed adequate knowledge of the growing rivalry between Britain and Germany in the years 1889-1911.

## **HISTORY (SYLLABUS B) 7262, GRADE BOUNDARIES**

---

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Lowest mark for award of grade	60	49	39	34	25

**Note:** Grade boundaries may vary from year to year and from subject to subject, depending on the demands of the question paper.

---





Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4LN, UK

Tel + 44 1623 450 781

Fax + 44 1623 450 481

Email: [intpublications@linneydirect.com](mailto:intpublications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code: UO 011317

For more information on Edexcel qualifications please contact us:

International Customer Relations Unit,

Stewart House, 32 Russell Square, London, WC1B 5DN, UK

Tel + 44 20 7758 5656

Fax + 44 20 7758 5959

[International@edexcel.org.uk](mailto:International@edexcel.org.uk)

[www.edexcel.org.uk/international](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/international)

Edexcel Foundation is a registered charity and a Company Limited  
By Guarantee Registered in England No. 1686164

