

## MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2008 question paper

### 9697 HISTORY

9697/01

Paper 1, maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2008 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

|        |                                |          |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Page 2 | Mark Scheme                    | Syllabus |
|        | GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2008 | 9697     |

### GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Examiners will assess which Level of Response best reflects most of the answer. An answer will be required to demonstrate all of the descriptions in a particular Level to qualify for a Mark Band. In bands of 3 or 4 marks, examiners will normally award the middle mark/one of the middle marks, moderating it up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer. In bands of 2 marks, examiners should award the lower mark if an answer just deserves the band and the higher mark if the answer clearly deserves the band.

| Band | Marks | Levels of Response   |
|------|-------|--|
| 1    | 21–25 | The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material and ideas. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The best answers must be awarded 25 marks.                   |
| 2    | 18–20 | Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided.   |
| 3    | 16–17 | Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence. |
| 4    | 14–15 | Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively.   |
| 5    | 11–13 | Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.      |
| 6    | 8-10  | Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.  |
| 7    | 0-7   | Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent. Marks at the bottom of this Band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answers usually make at least a few valid points.   |

|        |                                |          |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Page 3 | Mark Scheme                    | Syllabus |
|        | GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2008 | 9697     |

Section A: The Origins of World War I, 1870–1914

Source-Based Question: Analysis and Evaluation

1 'Serbia was most to blame for the Sarajevo Crisis.' Use Sources A–E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.

|   | CONTENT  | ANALYSIS [L2–3]   | EVALUATION [L4–5]  | CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES   | OTHER (e.g. Contextual knowledge)   |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| A | Strong anti-Austrian, anti-Franz Ferdinand statement by a member of a terrorist group. | Y-Threats expressed to Austria and the Archduke   | Y-Source can be accepted not only as the personal view of the writer but as the opinion of other members of the Black Hand.<br>N-Source comes from a member of a small group.<br>Although particularly violent, it was not representative of general Serbian opinion.  | Y-Source C agrees that there was widespread anti-Austrian feeling in Serbia.<br>N-Contradicted by Source D and especially Source E, the views of official Serbian opinion which is anxious to reach a settlement with Austria.  | Y- Serbia was the leading state in the Balkans that represented a serious nationalist threat to the diverse Austrian Empire. It might have done more to suppress violent groups.<br>N-The Serbian government was not responsible for the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. This act was condemned universally but Austria used it as an excuse to take action against Serbia. It did not enter negotiations seriously.   |
| B | Official letter from a German Ambassador to the Kaiser with his handwritten notes.     | Y-The Ambassador urged Austria to take a moderate attitude and avoid an extreme response.<br>N-William II realised that the situation was very serious and fully supported Austria. He did not urge moderation. | Y-The letter is authentic and probably reflects accurately the views of the Ambassador.<br>Y-The Kaiser's handwritten notes are authentic and reflect his reaction to the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand.<br>Y-Although the writers of B disagree about Austria's reactions, taken together they represent different German opinions. | Y-Agrees with Source A that the Austrians see danger in Serbia. Source C agrees that Serbian public opinion is very widely anti-Austrian.<br>N-Source D gives the cautious and anxious views of the French and British governments. There is also a reference to the fears of the Serbian government. | Y-By 1914, Austria was deeply suspicious of Serbia as the leader of hostile new independent states, threatening the further break-up of its Empire.<br>Y-Serbia did not act sufficiently to suppress anti-Austrian terrorist groups.<br>N-The Kaiser's notes reflect his complete support for Austria, e.g. the Blank Cheque, and his tendency to adopt hasty and immoderate attitudes.<br>N-The conditions that Austria made on Serbia were probably too humiliating to be acceptable. |

|   |   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| C | Letter of an Austrian diplomat to the Austrian Foreign Minister | Y-Anti-Austrian feeling was widespread in Serbia. All social and political groups were involved. There was even the (ludicrous) claim that Austria had caused the assassination. | Y-The diplomat was in Belgrade when he wrote the letter; he had first-hand knowledge.<br>N-He neglects the reasons for Serbian hostility to Austria.   | Y-Agrees with Source A, which is evidence of terrorist animosity to Austria. Agrees with the Kaiser in Source B that Austria had a justified grievance against Serbia.<br>N-Disagrees with D, the moderate views of other major states who do not condemn Serbia. Disagrees with Source E, which is an offer by the Serbian government to settle differences.        | Y-Anti-Austrian Serbia had been up for a long time. For example was the Balkans Wars. Austria felt itself on the defensive.<br>N-Serbia was a smaller country and did not represent a major threat, even to a declining Austria. |
| D | Letter from the French Ambassador to his Foreign Minister.      | N-Fears of an extreme Austrian reaction are shared by the governments of France, Britain and Serbia. Austria is seen as the major danger to peace.                               | Y-The letter probably represents accurately the discussions in which the Ambassador was involved.<br>N-Source does not appreciate the reasons why Austria was taking a strong line against Serbia. | Y-Source B partly agrees inasmuch as the German Ambassador dissuaded the Austrians from taking extreme measures. Source E agrees as the offer of the Serbian government to resolve differences with Austria.<br>N-Source C strongly disagrees. Source A can also be seen to disagree because it shows the unremitting hostility of an anti-Austrian terrorist group. | Y-France and Britain wished to defuse the Sarajevo crisis. The Serbian government was willing to make concessions.<br>N-The British government did not make its exact attitude sufficiently clear.                               |
| E | Message from a Serbian Ambassador to his Prime Minister.        | N-The Serbian government condemns the assassination of Franz Ferdinand and wishes to strengthen good relations with Austria.   | Y-The message is reliable because it is very probably authentic.<br>N-The Serbian government had not previously done all possible to suppress violent anti-Austrian groups.                        | Y-Source D agrees directly and indirectly. Source B partially agrees (the words of the German Ambassador).<br>N-Source A can be taken to disagree as can the Kaiser's notes in Source B. Source C strongly disagrees: opinion in Serbia is extremely anti-Austrian.  | Y-The Serbian government responded positively to Austrian demands after the Sarajevo assassination.<br>N-The Serbian government had tolerated the presence of some extreme anti-Austrian groups.                                 |

|        |                                |          |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Page 5 | Mark Scheme                    | Syllabus |
|        | GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2008 | 9697     |

## Marking Notes

[Note: all papers are to be marked using the generic marking bands for source-based and questions.)

### 1 Source-Based Question

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

These answers write about Sarajevo or even generally about 1914 but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss ‘Serbia was most to blame for the Sarajevo Crisis’ but will describe events very generally. Include in this level answers which use information taken from the sources but only in providing a summary of views expressed by the writers, rather than for testing the hypotheses. Alternatively, the sources might be ignored in a general essay answer.

L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE **OR** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6–8]

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context.

*For example, ‘Austria exaggerated the crisis caused by the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. The German Ambassador in Source B does not think that the Austrian government should take precipitate measures against Serbia, preferring a more considered approach. Source D states that the British Foreign Minister shared this view and believed that the Austrian government should be reasonable in its demands on Serbia. Source E gives the view of the Serbian government, in which it promised not to allow extremism against Austria in its territories. Those proved of being involved in the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand would be punished. The Serbian government wished for good relations with Austria.’ Or alternatively, ‘Austria did not exaggerate the crisis caused by the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. Source A portrays the extreme opinions of a member of a terrorist group even after the assassination. They represented a potent threat to Austria. In Source B, the Kaiser supported Austria and did not agree that Austria should be advised to be cautious. In Source C, the Austrian diplomat describes widespread extreme anti-Austrian feeling in Serbia after the assassination.’*

L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE **AND** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [9–13]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disconfirm it. However, sources are used only at face value.

*For example, ‘There is evidence for and against the claim that Serbia was most to blame for the Sarajevo Crisis. Source A supports the claim because it is evidence of the views of a member of a terrorist group that was completely anti-Austrian and completely critical of the visit to Sarajevo of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. He was not only expressing his own opinion. This is supported in Source B by the views of Kaiser William II and in Source C, the description of anti-Austrian feeling in Serbia. On the other hand, the claim is contradicted by other Sources. Source C records the fears of a Serbian Ambassador in Britain that Austria would overreact whilst Grey, the British Foreign Minister, had asked the Austrian government to pursue moderate policies. Source E proves that the Serbian government was willing to punish those who were responsible for the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and sought good relations with Austria.’*

|        |                                |          |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Page 6 | Mark Scheme                    | Syllabus |
|        | GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2008 | 9697     |

L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS.

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

*For example, 'It is more accurate that Austria exaggerated the crisis caused by the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. Source A is violently anti-Austrian and regards the Archduke as a tyrant. It was particularly offensive to issue such a statement soon after the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife. However, the Black Hand group was a small minority and not necessarily representative of the wider Serbian opinion. The Kaiser's support of stern Austrian action in Source B is typical of his volatile tendencies. It is not reliable as evidence of Austria's reaction. Source C is a long account of anti-Austrian feeling in Serbia but is not necessarily reliable although it is written by a diplomat. It is contradicted by the views of the Serbian Ambassador in Source D, who claims that Austria had pursued anti-Serbian policies for a long time, and even more by the Serbian Ambassador in Source E. There might have been strong anti-Austrian feeling in Serbia, as Source C reports, but Source E is strong evidence of the wish of the Serbian government not to provoke Austria. Source D includes the views of other governments. Both the French and British governments believe that the Austrian government should remain calm. There was a long history of ill feeling between Austria and the Balkan states, especially in Serbia. The assassination of a leading member of the Austrian royal family (the Emperor's heir) was particularly dramatic but Austria shared the blame for the poor relations between these countries.'*

L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [17–21]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

*For example, (L4 plus) '...However, the sources can also be interpreted to show that Serbia was most to blame for the Sarajevo Crisis. Source A comes from a member of a terrorist group that had carried out the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and its programme was widely supported in Serbia. There is no sign that the Black Hand would end its activities and, although it had few members, the danger that they represented had already been proved by their role in the assassination. Source B includes the provocative views of the Kaiser but the German Ambassador's letter does not criticise the Austrians for exaggerating the crisis; he only wishes the Austrians to be moderate in their response. Source C is strong evidence of the anti-Austrian sentiments in Serbia. The diplomat was correct in his belief that such feelings were very widespread in Serbia. It is also true that Serbia, like other Balkan states, believed that Austria was a declining power. Austria had to take strong action to counter this opinion. Even more insulting was the allegation that Austria had caused the assassination.'*

|        |                                |          |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Page 7 | Mark Scheme                    | Syllabus |
|        | GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2008 | 9697     |

L6 AS L5, PLUS **EITHER** (a) EXPLAIN WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE/SUPPORT IS PREFERRED, **OR** (b) RECONCILES/EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED. [22]

For (a), the argument must be that the evidence for challenging or supporting the claim is more justified. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but why some evidence is worse.

*For example, 'Although there is evidence in the Sources both to challenge and support the claim that Serbia was most to blame for the Sarajevo Crisis, the more convincing case contradicts the claim. The strongest evidence is from the Sources that show how anxious the Serbian government was to defuse the situation. These are Source D and especially Source E. Although Source D is a letter from the Ambassador of a country that was not friendly towards Austria, it is probably an accurate account of the discussions that he was involved in. It can be supported by own knowledge that the Serbian government was fearful of Austria and that the British government, represented by Grey, called for moderation. Source E is very probably an accurate account of a Serbian government's message to Austria and its wish to avoid extreme action. Source A should not be given much weight as justification for harsh policies by Austria. The members of the Black Hand group were few. They were a danger to Austria but this did not justify action against Serbia as a whole. The handwritten notes of William II in Source B are an exaggerated response in support of Austria. They contrast with the more sensible attitude of the German Ambassador in this extract. Whilst Source C is probably a generally accurate account of anti-Austrian feeling in Serbia, it ignores Austria's responsibility for bad relations between the states.'*

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it.

*For example, 'An alternative explanation is that, although Austria did not exaggerate the horror of the assassination in the short term, it was not justified in using it as the excuse for a major war against Serbia which was then to involve all of the major countries in Europe. The assassination did not only horrify Austria but all major European countries, the members of the Triple Entente as well as those of the Triple Alliance. Austria used the assassination to justify the complete suppression of Serbia, which had been its enemy for a long time. Source C is the only extract that refers to long-term issues and it is very one-sided. However, the crisis in Sarajevo can only be understood when we consider these long term issues, including the animosity between the Austrian Empire and the more recently independent Balkan states and Austria's membership of the Triple Alliance, with its rivalry to the major states in the Triple Entente. The Serbian government could have done more to suppress anti-Austrian terrorist groups but it did not have direct responsibility for the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo and tried seriously to defuse the situation.'*

|        |                                |          |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Page 8 | Mark Scheme                    | Syllabus |
|        | GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2008 | 9697     |

### Section B

#### Essay Questions

**2 How far did Napoleon Bonaparte ensure liberty and equality in his domestic government of France?**

The key issue is the nature of Napoleon's government of France. The question clearly refers to domestic issues; discussions of foreign policy or the impact of Napoleon's rule on other countries will not be relevant unless they are a brief part of introductions or conclusions. One would expect answers in Bands 1 (21–25) and 2 (18–20) to consider arguments for and against Napoleon's support for liberty and equality. However, examiners should not require an equal balance. The balance will reflect the argument. For example, it might reject 'liberal' measures as of minor importance. Answers in other Bands might plump for an argument that accepts or rejects 'liberty and equality;' without considering the alternative at all. It will be relevant to discuss the Code Napoleon (1804), an attempt to unify the diverse laws of France. Its confirmation of equality before the law and the end of privilege, and religious toleration would point towards Napoleon's liberalism. Careers were open to talent. However, associations of workers were banned and women were given fewer rights than men. Napoleon kept a tight hold on power through his autocratic rule. Officials were nominated and the Empire ensured Napoleon's personal rule. Opposition was suppressed and reference might be made to the work of Fouché as Minister of Police. Equality was limited by the restriction of promotion to Napoleon's supporters.

**3 Why did industrialisation have important political effects on Europe during the nineteenth century?**

**(You should refer to developments in at least two of the following countries: Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)**

The key issue is the link between industrialisation and political developments. Candidates are asked to refer to at least two countries. This should help to avoid vague responses. However, examiners will not expect any balance between the two or three countries and the question does not specify how much time should be given to particular examples. It will not be necessary to describe the development of the Industrial Revolution *per se* but to link developments to the key issue. It might be argued that the Industrial Revolution encouraged the growth of a new middle class. Its economic wealth enabled it to play a more important political role. Reference might be made to the Reform Acts (1832 and 1867) in Britain and to political advances in France from 1848. The position of the urban working class, although it lacked economic power, was enhanced by its concentration in large towns. Gradually political concessions had to be made to them, partly to avoid unrest. Reference might be made to the Reform Acts (1867 and 1884), with its supplements such as the Secret Ballot Act, in Britain and to political events in France. Political concessions were also made to the working class in Germany by the end of the nineteenth century. It will be relevant to discuss social reform, for example in education and housing, which came about largely because of the political pressures from the working class. High credit should be given when candidates point out the link between industrialisation and new political ideas such as Socialism and Marxism.



|        |                                |          |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Page 9 | Mark Scheme                    | Syllabus |
|        | GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2008 | 9697     |

**4 Why was Bismarck more successful than the revolutionaries of 1848–49 in Germany?**

The key issue is the contrast between Bismarck's success and the failure of the German revolutionaries in 1848–49. Examiners should expect a reasonable balance. 60:40 either way can merit any mark but 70:30 would normally lead to the award of one Band lower than would otherwise be given. However, as in all answers, the overall quality of the argument will be the most important criterion. An excellent discussion of Bismarck in an otherwise unbalanced answer might still be worth a high mark. Band 5 (11–13) will require a basic understanding of either Bismarck or the 1848–49 revolutions. The question asks 'Why?' and the most effective answers will be analytical but answers that contain sequential analyses of Bismarck and 1848–49 should not be undervalued. Bismarck was helped by Prussia's strong military power whereas the earlier revolutionaries had been militarily weak. He was supported by William I whereas Frederick William IV spurned the possibility of a German crown. However, Frederick William IV did introduce a comparatively liberal constitution that became attractive to other German states. Prussia's economy was strong; candidates can discuss the importance of the *Zollverein*. Bismarck was more skilful in handling the other German states. He was more successful in dealing with other countries through his diplomacy and use of war. Candidates can illustrate this through the Danish War (1864), the Austro-Prussian War (1866) and the Franco-Prussian War (1870). Meanwhile, Austria was a weaker rival by the 1860s and less able to prevent German unification.

**5 Explain the problems European countries faced in promoting imperial expansion during the later nineteenth century.**

The key issue is the problems faced by European countries when they engaged in imperial enterprises. Examiners will look for some examples, both from Europe and overseas. However, the range of possible overseas examples is wide and examiners will be realistic in their expectations. For example, some very good arguments might be supported by examples from a limited range of regions. There were problems in communication. Governments were sometimes involved in enterprises because of the actions of local officials, for example Britain and Cecil Rhodes. Sometimes different policies were favoured. For example, Bismarck was less enthusiastic than German public opinion. In spite of hopes for profits, imperial expansion could be expensive. Imperialism resulted in tensions between countries and added to military costs because larger and more expensive navies were needed. There was the danger of war and reference can be made to some crises such as Britain and France's involvement at Fashoda (1898). Some candidates might slant the question to use 'problems' as a device to explain the causes of imperialism, for example economic advantage or strategic interests. This will be valid as long as the link is made between causes and problems.

|         |                                |          |
|---------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Page 10 | Mark Scheme                    | Syllabus |
|         | GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2008 | 9697     |

**6 Why was the First World War so important in the downfall of the Romanov regime and the victory of the Bolsheviks?**

The key issue is the link between the First World War and the events of 1917. Candidates might take either of two approaches. 1914–17 might be seen as the culmination of a long decline of tsarist government, with less attention being given to the wartime period. Alternatively, answers might begin in 1914. Either approach is possible but the temptation in the first will be to spend too long on the pre-war period. In particular, the Bolsheviks were not in a strong position in 1914 and answers in Band 1 (21–25) and Band 2 (18–20) will need to show a sound understanding of the Bolshevik victory by the end of 1917. Answers that deal only with the February or the October Revolutions might find it difficult to get beyond Band 3 (16–17). The war discredited Nicholas II's regime. Russia suffered heavy defeats with massive casualties. The resulting inflation ruined an economy that had been improving by 1914 but was still too weak to sustain the pressures of the conflict. Food became short. The Tsar's decision to take personal command showed his lack of ability as a military leader but it also discredited him politically. Russia was left to the rule of Tsarina Alexandra and Rasputin. The outcome was the February Revolution. In spite of their later propaganda, Lenin and the Bolsheviks were not important in this rising. Kerensky and the Provisional Government failed to establish a stable government. They tried to deal with grievances about food and land but ineffectively. The many political groups could not be managed. The war continued unsuccessfully and the resulting grievances increased. Although Lenin and the Bolsheviks were checked in the July Days, Kornilov's attempted coup discredited Kerensky. The October Revolution showed the ability of Lenin and the Bolsheviks, although a minority, to take decisive action. Lenin's promise of major reforms and slogans such as 'All power to the soviets' had an enthusiastic response. Lenin soon abandoned his offer of a coalition government to install the Bolsheviks firmly in power.

**7 'The unpopularity of the Versailles settlement was the most important reason why Hitler gained power in 1933.' How far do you agree with this judgement?**

The key issue is the reasons why Hitler came to power in 1933. Candidates might continue the explanation throughout 1933 by explaining the sequence of events from his appointment as Chancellor to the introduction of the Enabling Act. However, answers that end with the Chancellor's appointment can merit any mark. The question asks candidates to consider particularly the importance of the Versailles settlement. This dismantled the German military. Colonies were surrendered. There were territorial concessions in Europe, especially the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France and the loss of areas in the east to Poland. People who were regarded as German were living in other countries. Reparations had to be paid. Unification with Austria was forbidden. The War Guilt clause attributed blame for the First World War to Germany. Hatred of the settlement, the 'stab in the back' and the 'November Criminals' united Germans. This can form the basis of a good answer. However, answers in Band 1 (21–25) and Band 2 (18–20) can be expected to go further and compare Versailles as a reason with other factors. Weimar Germany did not establish a stable democracy. Proportional representation allowed small parties to exert undue politician influence. Changes of government were frequent. Extreme right and left-wing parties caused tensions. However, high credit should be given to candidates who understand the limited appeal of the Nazis in the 1920s. The Munich Putsch (1923) was put down easily. The army and the Junkers/traditionally strong right-wing social classes continued to exert influence. Nevertheless, Weimar seemed to have been more successful in the 1920s. It alleviated the worst economic effects of the war, came to agreements about the repayment of reparations and was accepted as a leading member of the League of Nations. The death of Stresemann was a blow and it can be argued that the Wall Street Crash (1929) that drove the Weimar Republic off-course. Hitler himself was an effective leader. He built up the Nazis through organisation and propaganda to become the second largest party in the 1930 election and the largest in 1932 – but they actually lost support in a later election that year. He kept his nerve when others, such as von Papen, thought that they could control him, refusing to accept any office except Chancellor.

|         |                                |          |
|---------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Page 11 | Mark Scheme                    | Syllabus |
|         | GCE A/AS LEVEL – May/June 2008 | 9697     |

**8 How different were Stalin’s policies in governing Russia to 1939 from those of Nicholas II?**

The key issue is the contrast between Stalin and Nicholas II. Examiners can look for a balanced approach. 60:40 either way can merit any mark but 70:30 would normally lead to the award of one Band lower than would otherwise be given. However, as in all answers, the overall quality of the argument will be the most important criterion. An excellent discussion of either Stalin or Nicholas II in an otherwise unbalanced answer might still be worth a high mark. Candidates are free to argue that the similarities were more important than the differences: they were both autocrats; they suppressed political opposition; their secret police operated outside the law; they represented a personal cult of government. However, it might be claimed that Stalin’s rule was more brutal. The millions of casualties went far beyond the numbers who were prosecuted/persecuted by Nicholas II. Their ideologies were different. Stalin claimed, justifiably or not, that his regime was based on Marxism. Nicholas II ruled by divine right. A few candidates might mention their different attitudes to religion and the Church but this is not necessary for any mark. Their economic policies were different. Stalin regarded economic change as a high priority. He pushed through radical reforms in agriculture and industry that had wholesale social implications. Nicholas II allowed some economic reforms – for example the policies of Witte and Stolypin – but they were not particularly important to his conservative mind. Nicholas II was averse to change, unlike Stalin who introduced constant political social and economic change. Although he enjoyed an autocratic position, Nicholas II was personally weak, open to advice especially from the Tsarina. He allowed some courtiers and Rasputin to have too much influence. Stalin shared power with nobody. He destroyed those who helped him to power, including Kamenev, Zinoviev and Bukharin. The purges destroyed people who were not a real threat to his regime.