

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2008 question paper**

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>9697 HISTORY</b></p> <p><b>9697/01</b>                      Paper 1, maximum raw mark 100</p> |
|---|

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 October/November 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 LEVEL – October/November 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.

| 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 LEVEL – October/November 2008 | 9697     |

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

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

**Source-based question: Analysis and Evaluation**

**1 ‘Kaiser William II was not to blame for the outbreak of war in 1914.’ 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 | Personal telegram from the Kaiser to the Tsar. | Y - William II fears the danger of war, claims friendship with Russia and promises to influence Austria-Hungary.        | Y - a personal statement.<br>N - a one-sided account and ignores German hostile policies.   | Y - C: Germany did not expect war and Russia had promised not to declare war. D: Kaiser was innocent of blame.<br><br>N - B: William II's handwritten notes are extreme in tone and content.<br>E: British minister criticises the Kaiser's personality and role. | Y: Germany was not solely responsible for the outbreak of the war.<br>N - German policy, especially full support for Austria-Hungary, might have been the most important factor in the crisis. |
| B | Diplomatic report and added handwritten notes. | N - Lichnowsky seems to accept British preference for mediation. The handwritten notes are extreme in tone and content. | Y - the despatch is probably a reliable account of the conversation with Grey.<br>Y/N - the handwritten notes are very reliable evidence of William II's views but deny warlike intentions. | Y - William II's attitude is confirmed by E.<br>N - Contradicted by German sources A, C and D.  | Y - Britain was anxious to defuse the crisis and the handwritten notes can be confirmed by other knowledge about the Kaiser.   |

|        |                                     |          |
|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Page 4 | Mark Scheme                         | Syllabus |
|        | GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008 | 9697     |

|   |          |   |  |  |  |
|---|----------|---|--|--|--|
| C | Memoirs. | Y - William II did not expect war and believed that he was on friendly terms with Russia. | N - Memoirs usually justify the writer.  | Y - Confirmed by other German sources A and D. N - Contradicted by E and partially by B.   | Y - The... about even... are true.<br>N - The source ignores German policy that had helped to create the crisis.   |
| D | Memoirs  | Y - The Kaiser did not expect war and was not responsible for the crisis.                 | N - Memoirs usually justify the writer. This source defends the Kaiser uncritically. | Y - Confirmed by other German sources A and C. N - Contradicted by E and partially by B.   | Y - Germany probably did not think that the crisis would end in war.<br>N - The source underestimates German support for Austria-Hungary, the trigger for war. |
| E | Memoirs  | N - William II was an incapable ruler.  | N - Memoirs usually justify the writer.  | Y - Confirmed by handwritten notes in B. N - Contradicted by German sources in A, C and D. | Y - The account of William II's personality can be confirmed, as can the influence over the Kaiser of the military class.                                      |

|        |                                     |          |
|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Page 5 | Mark Scheme                         | Syllabus |
|        | GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008 | 9697     |

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES.

These answers write about William II or even generally about Germany 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 *'Kaiser William II was not to blame for the outbreak of war in 1914'*. 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, *'William II was not to blame. Source A shows that he was trying to be friendly towards Russia and Source C says that he did not expect war to break out. Source E also shows that he had not planned or expected war.'* Or alternatively, *'William II was to blame. Although Source A claims that he was friendly to Russia, Source B shows that his real policies were different. The Kaiser was extremely anti-British and he was unwilling to reach a settlement. Source E shows that the Kaiser was weak and therefore his policies led to war.'*

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 William II was to blame for the outbreak of the war. Sources A, C and D support this view because they prove that the Kaiser wanted to secure peace and did not expect war. On the other hand, Source B shows the Kaiser's extremely anti-British feelings. Source E is correct to attribute the responsibility for the war to William II because of his inadequate personal qualities.'*

L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE **OR** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [14–16]

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 to conclude that William II was not to blame. The contents of Source A show how far the assassination at Sarajevo angered Germany but the Kaiser wished to secure a settlement between Austria and Russia. The telegram represents the Kaiser's personal view and the friendly tone is confirmed by the end by the use of 'Willy'. Source B does show that the Kaiser was unreasonable. His notes are reliable evidence of his true feelings because he would not expect them to be widely published. However, he believed that Britain was not taking a sufficiently active stance against France and Russia. Source C represents the personal view of William II and, although Memoirs can be unreliable, it contains facts about events that can be checked. Source D is from another memoir, written by a leading German admiral. However, Tirpitz was most concerned to acquit the Kaiser of blame for the war.'*

|        |                                     |          |
|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Page 6 | Mark Scheme                         | Syllabus |
|        | GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008 | 9697     |

L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS.

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, some sources do show that William was responsible. The friendly tone of Source A does not hide the fact that the Kaiser was the firm ally of Austria-Hungary, the enemy of Russia. The margin notes in Source B are very telling evidence because they point to the Kaiser's direct responsibility for the bad relations between Britain and Germany. Source C is of doubtful value because the Kaiser was seeking to vindicate himself in his memoirs. Source D was written by a close ally of the Kaiser and an important military official in Germany before the war. He also wished to remove any blame from William II. Although Source E was written by somebody who was to lead the British war effort, his judgements of the Kaiser are accurate, as can be sustained from other evidence.'*

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

[22–25]

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 about the extent to which William II should be blamed, the most convincing case is that he did not do enough to avoid war and even encouraged it. In spite of his statement in Source A, the Kaiser did not try energetically to persuade Austria-Hungary to reach an agreement with Russia. The weight of the other Sources supports this conclusion because those that are critical of William II are more reliable than those that support him. The strongest evidence against William II is his handwritten notes in Source B. Their tone and content show a ruler who was not in control of the situation.'*

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 William II should be blamed not because he deliberately sought war but because his mistakes and misunderstandings led to hostilities. Source A shows that he did not fully appreciate the rivalry between Russia and Austria-Hungary. His irrational attitude to Britain in Source B shows his lack of understanding of the international situation and of British policy in particular. Sources C and D can be interpreted to show that the Kaiser might not have wished for war but that he was not aware of the growing tensions that involved Germany and all the major European countries. This judgement is supported by Source E. Lloyd George believed that the Kaiser "allowed himself to be dragged into war". Nevertheless, his weakness does not absolve him from blame in view of the importance of Germany and of his role in its government.'*

|        |                                     |          |
|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Page 7 | Mark Scheme                         | Syllabus |
|        | GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008 | 9697     |

**Section B**

**2 Why did the French ancien régime collapse in 1789?**

The key issue is the end of the ancien régime at a specific point. The question asks ‘Why..?’ and the most successful answers will focus on analysis, highlighting and explaining a series of reasons. Adequate but more limited essays might be descriptive, making a series of valid points without explaining the link between general factors and the end of the régime. There might be little sense of period; that is, the long-term causes of the French Revolution will be examined but not the short-term issues that led to the events of 1789. The question clearly excludes developments from 1789. Weak answers will probably be very vague and assertive, lacking sufficient factual knowledge to support their claims. Candidates might consider the considerable financial problems of Louis XVI’s government. An inefficient fiscal system that weighed most heavily on those who were less able to pay, giving extensive exemptions to some wealthy groups, brought in too little money. Expenses were very heavy, especially the costs of intervention in the War of American Independence. Attempts by successive ministers such as Calonne and Necker to reform the system were foiled by opposition from privileged groups. Louis XVI himself was too weak to insist on changes although his task was extremely difficult in view of his legacy from Louis XV. France was ruled by an absolute monarchy but social groups such as the higher nobility and the Church hierarchy, as well as institutions such as the parlements, were able to impede change. Feudal traditions in landholding and services continued. In the 1780s, there was a series of poor harvests that caused distress. Some candidates might refer to the effects of enlightened thinkers, the philosophes, although some have doubted their real effect in bringing about the downfall of the régime. The meeting of the Estates General showed the confusion in the system; it broke down over the basic point of voting rights. Credit should be given to candidates who show some knowledge of the cahiers. However, the grievances were not directed at the monarchy as such, not at Louis XVI himself. They sought reform, not revolution.

**3 Were European governments strengthened or weakened by the development of industry in their countries? (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 effects of industrialisation on governments. Candidates are asked to refer to at least two countries in order to substantiate their arguments. However, the references can be brief and no balance is required between the two/three countries used as examples. Nor will the mark depend on whether candidates draw on two or three countries. The most successful answers, worth 21–25 marks, might be expected to discuss both positive and negative effects but again no balance is required. Excellent answers might be weighted towards one side but they will show an ability to consider alternatives. It might be argued that governments were strengthened by the economic benefits that followed from the development of industry. The political importance of Britain, Germany and, to some extent France, reflected their success in developing industrial economies. Some candidates might make a link to military power. Armies, navies and warfare generally changed because of industrial advances. Industry created wealth that could underpin governments; tax revenues increased. Industry also created problems. New classes emerged that challenged the existing political structures and authorities. For example, in Britain there were demands for changes to the franchise by the middle and lower classes. The (male) middle classes gained the vote by the middle of the nineteenth century and most of the (male) working class by the end of the century. In Prussia-Germany, the traditional landowning Junker class were pressed by the middle classes and governments had to meet the challenge of socialism by the end of the century. The middle and lower classes in France were a continuing challenge to authoritarian governments. The revolutions of 1830 and 1848 originated to significant extents in the changes induced by industrialisation. It will be relevant – but not necessary – to compare countries that were developed industrially with those that were economically backward. This can be a very effective approach and is not excluded by the question.

|        |                                     |          |
|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Page 8 | Mark Scheme                         | Syllabus |
|        | GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008 | 9697     |

**4 Why did Piedmont play a leading role in the unification of Italy from 1848 to 1871?**

The key issue is the role of Piedmont in Italian unification. Candidates should note the significant dates. It is very likely most candidates will pay much attention to the work of Cavour but the most successful answers should go beyond his death in 1861. The question asks 'Why..?' and more credit will be given to answers that are analytical than to those that are limited to narrative description. Weak candidates might only describe the general development of unification without showing much knowledge and understanding of Piedmont and Cavour in particular. Charles Albert played an important, if ultimately unsuccessful part in the revolutions of 1848-49, but he put Piedmont at the centre of resistance to Austria's power in Italy. Victor Emmanuel II did not play a very active part personally but gave weight to Piedmont's position in the Risorgimento. As a constitutional-monarchical state, Piedmont was better able to secure support from the governments of other countries, especially France, Britain and Prussia. Its economy was more developed than other Italian states, especially in the south. It had a larger army but still had to rely on outside military and diplomatic assistance. From 1850 as Minister of Agriculture, Marine and Commerce, then Minister of Finance, Cavour improved the economy and related parts of the state, such as communications. Prime Minister from 1852, he built relationships with other European governments and strengthened the army. Candidates can explain his policies and methods to 1861 to extend Piedmont's influence. This was firmly established within the new Italy by the time of his death and it continued to 1870. However, Victor Emmanuel and his government recognised the historic importance of Rome, which then became the capital of the kingdom, although the constitution closely reflected that of Piedmont. Negative reasons for Piedmont's importance might include the weakness of the republicans and those who pursued more populist policies. This might include Mazzini and his followers although Garibaldi was persuaded to surrender his gains in the south to monarchist Piedmont/Italy. Other groups were divided in their aims and lacked the resources and leadership to succeed.

**5 Why did imperialism cause rivalries between European countries in the later nineteenth century?**

The question asks 'Why..?' and the most successful answers will focus on analysis, providing a series of reasons for European rivalries. Some limited answers might provide only a series of causes of imperial expansion and imply that they caused rivalries to grow. This approach will not be irrelevant but will probably not be able to merit a high mark band. Answers that describe causes without making even implicit links with rivalries cannot merit more than 11 marks. A characteristic of the most successful answers will be that they include some examples, although examiners are reminded that these will necessarily be selective within the time available to candidates. Imperialism threatened to disturb the European balance of power. Particular examples might include Fashoda (Britain and France), Morocco (Britain, France and Germany) and British and German attitudes to the Boers. The 'Scramble' reflected the fear that countries would be left behind. Imperial expansion was also a sign of national power and prosperity. Countries such as Italy were involved for this reason, although the regions of Italy's overseas influence had little economic value. In spite of the size of the areas of expansion, there were disputes over frontiers and areas of influence, such as that between Britain and France and Britain and Germany in Africa. There were economic rivalries in the search for raw materials. Economic conditions in Europe were difficult and imperial expansion offered the opportunity for more trade to circumvent protection. Popular opinion put pressure on governments, who were sometimes reluctant to get involved. An example of this might be Bismarck.



|        |                                     |          |
|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Page 9 | Mark Scheme                         | Syllabus |
|        | GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008 | 9697     |

6 'The underlying causes of the 1905 Revolution in Russia were not political. What the revolutionaries wanted, it was not the overthrow of the Tsar.' How far do you agree with this claim?

The key issue is the causes of the 1905 Revolution in Russia. The basic cause was probably social discontent and especially the consequences of the burden of taxation that followed from Witte's policy of industrialisation. In addition, the Russo-Japanese War was an immediate factor. Defeat did not have only military repercussions. It was a blow to Russian morale and seemed to limit Russia's potential as a great power (until it became more active in the Balkans). Father Gapon's March at St. Petersburg led to the violent suppression known as Bloody Sunday and this was accompanied by risings and strikes elsewhere. Dissatisfaction spread among the middle class and some elements of the military, particularly the navy (the Potemkin). However, there is little evidence that Lenin and the Bolsheviks played a major role. Lenin was in exile and returned to Russia too late to play an important, even less successful, role. The Tsar was weakened and had to concede the October Manifesto (1906) but the Revolution was not primarily a protest against him. He was still held in considerable esteem. The marchers at St. Petersburg carried icons and pictures of Nicholas II. With a comparatively small number of radicals, there was no significant demand at that time for the abolition of the monarchy. However, there were more voices for constitutional concessions by the Tsar. Credit might be given when candidates note how diverse were the demands of the various groups that were involved. Social protest is an umbrella term for varied demands. Candidates should note that the question is about the causes of the 1905 revolution. The consequences will not be relevant although it is noted above that the October Manifesto can be used to confirm the political pressures on the Tsar.

7 How similar were the Nazi dictatorship in Germany and the Fascist dictatorship in Italy to 1939?

The key issue is the comparison of Nazi and Fascist dictatorships. It is reasonable to expect a balanced discussion. 60:40 either way can merit any mark whilst 70:30 will normally lead to the award of one lower than would otherwise be awarded. 11 marks will require an adequate understanding and knowledge of one of the two aspects. 'How similar...?' means that candidates should look at the limits of similarities and therefore at differences. The most successful essays might well deal with a series of relevant factors, examining how far they show similarities and differences. However, sequential accounts, for example Germany first then Italy, might be very sound if points of comparison and contrast are made consistently. On the other hand, answers that only describe two sets of developments with a minimum of comparison/contrast cannot reach a high mark. There were similarities in ideology. Nazism and Fascism promoted the interests of the state above those of individuals. They were totalitarian, intolerant of alternative theories and parties. Power was concentrated at the top in the hands of one man: Führer or Duce. They were very nationalistic in outlook. In practice, both governments enforced their powers through harsh laws and police forces. Some economic policies were similar, especially the use of public works and heavy state-intervention. State propaganda was used to win and maintain support for the regimes. Individuals and groups were encouraged to identify with the state, for example the young. The personal importance and contributions of the leaders were emphasised. However, there were differences. Italian Fascism was not as extremely suppressive as Germany's Nazism. For example, there was little overt anti-Semitism in Italy by 1939. Opponents were persecuted but there were no concentration and extermination camps.

|         |                                     |          |
|---------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Page 10 | Mark Scheme                         | Syllabus |
|         | GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008 | 9697     |

**8 How far did Stalin, to 1939, continue the policies of Lenin?**

The key issue is the link between Stalin and Lenin. 'How far..?' allows candidates to argue either change or continuity was more important. Weak answers might describe some of Stalin's policies without making any attempt to compare or contrast them with Lenin's work. It will be difficult to award 11 marks to such essays. Candidates might organise their answers sequentially, describing Lenin first and then writing accounts of Stalin. The comparison/contrast might be mostly implied rather than specified. These answers might be acceptable but will probably not be worth a very high mark. Examiners will not require an even balance between Stalin and Lenin for even the highest mark because very sound answers can focus on Stalin as long as they continue to comment how far he adhered to, or departed from, the policies of Lenin. Stalin claimed to continue Lenin's policies. This was necessary for any post-revolutionary leader. One of the justifications for the purge of Trotsky and his followers was that they departed from Lenin's teachings. Stalin gained power by claiming to be Lenin's true successor, although candidates can explain how he manipulated himself into power. He cancelled the features of the NEP that were associated with private enterprise, although Lenin justified the NEP as a (necessary) temporary measure; the policies of collectivisation went much further than Lenin advocated. Some might claim that Stalin's purges were different from the methods used by Lenin. Their scale was greater, although Lenin had insisted on one-party government and the dominance of the Bolsheviks. However, he was more pragmatic than Stalin and his personal role, whilst dominant, was not as obtrusive and destructive as that of Stalin. The 'cult of personality' was more pronounced under Stalin. On the other hand, the structure of the state was very similar under both men.