

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

9697 HISTORY

9697/12

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, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

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

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

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

Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	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: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

SECTION A: THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR I, 1870–1914

SOURCE-BASED QUESTION: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

'Austria was to blame for tensions in the Balkans before World War I.' 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	Judgement by a modern historian.	Y – Austria adopted more positive policies in the Balkans. Germany supported Austria. Y – The Triple Entente was weak. N – Austria was responding to Slav nationalism.	The Source is secondary. Y – There is a brief reference to Serbian nationalism but mostly reflects criticism of Austria and Germany, although the Triple Entente is judged ineffective. Y – Although the judgement is not balanced, one can probably accept the objectivity of the writer.	Y – Austria's policies heightened tensions. Aided by Germany, it was taking advantage of the weakness of the Triple Entente countries. Y – D agrees about the danger to Austria. Y – E Peace would come only if Austria was divided. N – B shows that Serbian nationalism was aggressive. The writer welcomes war. N – C states that Austrian policies were too weak.	Most of the views are convincing. Events are discussed accurately. The last sentence, looking forward to 1914, is an interesting comparison. However, it does not spend much time considering Austria's fears. Other evidence for developments in the Balkans before 1914 can be considered.
B	Newspaper publication by an important Serbian.	War between Serbia and Austria was inevitable. Serbian interests demanded war.	Y – His views, whilst not objective, are useful as those of extreme Slav elements. N – The writer was not only a leading Serbian intelligence official but a founder of a terrorist organisation.	Y – A mostly agrees although it is not as extreme as B. N – C disagrees claiming that Austrian policy is too weak rather than too aggressive. N – D disagrees and sees Austrian policy towards the Serbs as justified. N – Russia welcomes the partition of Austria, justifying Austrian fears.	The dangers posed by Slav terrorism can be explained as well as the extent of its links to Serbia. The Serbian government denies these links.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

C	Report by the German Ambassador to Austria.	Austrians believed that policy on the Slav problem was too hesitant. The fate of Austria as a great power was at stake.	Y – The report of Austrian opinions is probably accurate as far as it goes. Y – there were widespread fears in Austria about the future. N – The report is based on unreliable opinions. Journalists were not necessarily objective. Military chiefs might have exaggerated the threat.	Y – D agrees that Austria had to act positively even if the result was a general war. N – A contradicts the view that Austrian policy was too weak. N – B sees the Serbs as defensive against Austrian imperialism. Y/N – Russia welcomes the division of Austria but the source confirms Austrian fears of the Serbs.	Austria's role as a Great Power and the threat posed by the Slavs to a multi-racial empire might be examined.
D	Speech by Kaiser William II to his military chiefs.	Germany supported Austria's strong action against Serbia. Russian support for Serbia would result in war.	Y? – War was very likely - but was it inevitable if Russia supported Serbia? N – The British navy would not be involved in the Balkans crisis. N – The audience does not indicate that William was objective.	Y – C agrees that Austria needed to be active against Serbia. N – A criticises Austria's active policy against Serbia. N – B sees Austria as a threat to Serbia and Slavs at large. E – The Tsar welcomes the partition of Austria as making for peace.	Contextual knowledge might include the reasons for Russia's support of the Slavs and the reasons why Germany felt obliged to intervene might be considered. The consequences of a naval war with Britain arising out of the Balkans crisis might be examined.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

E	Report by a British diplomat of a conversation with Nicholas II.	Russia believed that the growth of Serbia and the partition of Austria would result in peace.	Y – The report is probably an accurate account of the conversation. N – The Tsar's remarks, either deliberately or inadvertently, misjudge the situation.	Y – B indicates Serbian / Slav ambitions which aimed to weaken Austria. Y – C criticises Austrian policies as liable to bring defeat for Austria and the loss of Slavs. Y – An unsuccessful policy against Slavs within Serbia would lead to the loss of Slavs within Austria. N – A gives no evidence of the danger of an Austrian partition except for the hint of growing Slav nationalism.	The con... knowledge... refer to the la... of homogeneity in the Austrian empire. Austria feared a domino effect if one part separated. Knowledge might be used to assess how far the Tsar's prediction of peace was justified.
---	--	---	--	---	---

NB: These responses indicate only one way to analyse and evaluate the passages. Alternative arguments can be proposed as long as they are soundly based.
Key: Y & N, i.e. The source supports or challenges the hypothesis.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

1 Source-Based Question

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES

These answers write generally about the causes of World War I but will ignore the key issues in the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information / evidence to test the given hypothesis that *Austria was to blame for tensions in the Balkans before World War I*. For example, they will not discuss but might make only general points about the causes of the war. 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 hypothesis. 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, 'It is true that Austria was to blame for tensions in the Balkans before World War I. Source A explains in detail how Austria's policies increased tensions before the war. Proposals to mediate by Britain and Russia were ignored. Bosnia was annexed and Austria used bullying tactics. Source B shows that Serbia was on the defensive against Austria and could retain its honour only by going to war. Source D justifies Austrian strong action against the Slavs in Serbia.'

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, [in addition to L2], 'There is evidence for and against the claim that Austria was to blame for tensions in the Balkans before World War I. Source C shows that Austrian policy was uncertain and too weak to pose a threat. The major threat was from Slav ambitions. Serbia's ambitions were a danger to Austria's security. Source E explains that Austria was in danger of partition.'

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 Austria was to blame for tensions in the Balkans before World War I. Source A can be accepted as a very useful explanation of developments in the Balkans with Austria as the major culprit. The events are described accurately and the balance of power between the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente shows Austria at an advantage. Although the Kaiser was making a speech to his military chiefs in Source D and may well have been exaggerating the situation, his interpretation is basically convincing because a failure to control the Slavs in Serbia might well have led to loss of control within Austria itself. Source E is probably accurate as an account of the British Ambassador's conversation with Nicholas II although other things might have been said that are omitted. However, the Tsar himself was not objective, reflecting Russia's loyalty to the Slavs. Austria contained many races, including Slavs and others. The loss of the Slavs might lead to the disintegration of the whole Austrian empire.'

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	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, the sources can also be interpreted to show that Austria was not to blame for tensions in the Balkans before World War I. Source B can be used to shift the blame to Serbia and the Slavs at large. The writer was not only a senior military intelligence figure but also the founder of a feared terrorist organisation showing the links between the Serbian government, or at least the army, and Slav terrorism. Journalists are not necessarily reliable but, in Source C, the German Ambassador was probably reporting accurately the despondent mood of many Austrians. There was also uncertainty in the Austrian army about Austrian policies although military figures often wanted more aggressive policies. Source E can be used to show Austria’s weakness although the Tsar’s conclusion that this would result in peace is not entirely persuasive.

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 that Austria was to blame for tensions in the Balkans before World War I the more convincing argument supports the claim. Austria sparked off several crises in the Balkans before 1914 because it was determined to limit Slav nationalism. Serbia was a much smaller country and Austria gambled wrongly that Russia would back down in 1914 as it had previously. This is shown in Source A, the least subjective of all of the extracts. The evidence of William II in Source D is dubious because we know that he was urging Austria strongly to act against Serbia. For example, he backed Austria’s strong demands after the Sarajevo assassination and authorised a ‘blank cheque’ to discourage Austria from making concessions. His belief that Britain would be involved is almost an afterthought, showing his lack of judgment. Britain would probably not have intervened if Belgium had not been invaded.’

OR

‘...the stronger claim is that Austria was to blame for tensions in the Balkans before World War I because the evidence against the claim is less convincing. Source B is unreliable. It is the view of an extreme anti-Austrian and somebody who promoted terrorism. It ignores the reasons why Austria feared Slav nationalism. Source C does reflect Austria’s fears of Slav nationalism but it ignores the Austrian policies that had caused previous crises, for example the annexation of Bosnia. This one-sided view also ignores the basic problems of the multi-racial Austrian empire. It was not a modern nation state but the remnant of a sprawling and inefficient nineteenth-century country before nationalism had developed. Source D also has limitations as worthwhile evidence. William II was preoccupied by his vision of Germany as the greatest of world powers. Austria was really a useful tool to achieve this aim. Although Germany had no direct interest in the Slavs, the Sources show how Austria could rely on Germany when pursuing aggressive policies. An analysis of the final stages of the 1914 crisis shows that Austria used the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand to impose unnecessarily severe demands on Serbia. This followed the pattern of events outlined in Source A.’

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to modify the hypothesis (not simply seeking to support / contradict) in order to improve it.

For example, 'An alternative explanation is that Austria and the Slavs were equally to blame for the tensions in the Balkans before World War I and that this mutual rivalry resulted in the unnecessary intervention of other countries. Serbia had ambitions to be the leading Slav nation and this was obviously a threat to Austria. Austria could have offered more moderate terms to Serbia but it is actually doubtful if the Serbian government could have contained the Slav extremists. During all of this time, Germany and Russia were willing to use this rivalry to serve their own interests.'

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

SECTION B

2 How far do you agree that, from 1799 to 1815, Napoleon achieved more in domestic than in foreign affairs?

The key issue is the assessment of Napoleon. Candidates are asked to consider and compare two aspects. Answers in Bands 1 and 2 (18–20 and 21–25) will be reasonably balanced. 60:40 will be appropriate. Candidates can spend more time on their preferred choice. Band 5 (11–13) might be a suitable ceiling for answers that consider only one. The discriminating characteristic in the most successful answers will be the ability to provide an assessment. The instruction to consider if 'more' was achieved involves looking at a range of achievements but the comparative element can only be done at the highest level if Napoleon's limitations are examined. Answers in the two highest bands will also show an adequate coverage of the specified period. However, the scope of the question is wide and examiners will not expect comprehensive answers for the highest band. As always, they will look first for positive aspects before looking for, and assessing, gaps. Candidates will need to provide factual support for claims but should avoid meandering descriptions. Answers might be structured in a number of ways to examine where Napoleon was greater. Some might consider how far he achieved his aims. Others might give priority to the extent to which he changed France and Europe (within the topic's focus on France – candidates are not expected to have specific knowledge of other countries). It will be allowable to go further than 1815 in a conclusion but not as a substantive part of the answer.

3 How far was the Agricultural Revolution the most important factor leading to the Industrial Revolution? (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is the link between agricultural and industrial development. Candidates are required to refer to two of three named countries. With a minimum of two, the number of countries used to illustrate the argument will not affect the mark but examiners will expect fewer individual references when three are included. The question asks if the Agricultural Revolution was the most important factor in the Industrial Revolution. This means that candidates can argue the priority of other factors and therefore give these more space in their answers. However, answers in Band 5 (11–13) will need a basic understanding of agricultural change even if its importance is questioned. The Agricultural Revolution resulted in greater food production. This was one of the reasons for the growth in population, providing more manpower and larger markets. At the same time, it put pressure on rural areas. Land was less available whilst more efficient farming methods caused unemployment. There was a move to towns to seek employment, which had an impact on industrial growth. There was a link between scientific innovation and technology. Canals were developed in an agricultural age and were a stage towards the railways, when many of the same techniques were used to build the lines. Early capitalism depended on the involvement of landowners and some of the early inventors worked in an agricultural rather than an industrial society. It can be argued that Britain's lead in changing from a pre-industrial society and economy was one of the main reasons why it took a prominent part in industrialisation whilst France and Germany were slower to change. The French economy was predominantly agrarian until well into the nineteenth century. Disunited German states were mostly highly agrarian although Prussia was more industrialised. The emphasis in both was on land.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

4 Assess the impact of nationalism on the 1848–49 revolutions in Germany and Italy

The key issue is the impact of nationalism on Germany and Italy at a specific stage. candidates are likely to see nationalism as synonymous with support for unification but high credit should be given to answers that are aware of the distinction. Examiners will expect answers that are reasonably balanced between Germany and Italy. 60:40 either way - probably in favour of Italy – can merit any mark but answers with 70:30 will normally be awarded a mark one band lower than would otherwise be awarded. Band 5 (11–13) will need a basic understanding of one country. The question does not specifically ask for a comparison and a two-part answer can achieve any mark. However, if valid comparisons are included, they should be rewarded. Although the focus should be on 1848–49, it will be relevant to discuss the causes of the revolutions. Some might argue that anti-Austrian feeling was stronger in Italy than nationalism, which appealed to a minority. Mazzini struggled to win support for his cause. The Carbonari and Young Italy had limited support. Others, such as the Federalists, favoured programmes that were hardly nationalistic but were policies to safeguard the rights of individual states. Risings in the 1830s were put down easily. 1848 was the most clear sign of nationalism but evidence of unity was slight. Although rulers of some states conceded constitutions, they were back in control by the end of 1849. Metternich was as active in Germany as he had been in Italy to secure order and suppress nationalism. After 1815, support for a united Germany was confined to a small group of intellectuals and students. Candidates might refer to the Carlsbad Decrees (1819) which struck at nationalism and associated liberalism in Germany. Nationalism revived by 1848, assisted as in Italy by poor economic conditions. During the revolutions of 1848–49, there were calls for a united Germany, culminating in the Frankfurt Parliament. However, its failure was due to limited support as well as poor leadership. The attitude of Frederick William IV of Prussia was also crucial. He rejected the offer of the German crown. Some very able candidates might argue that nationalism played a minor role in both areas and that the revolutions arose from different grievances and factors.

5 Why was there a 'Scramble for Africa' in the late nineteenth century?

The key issue is the reasons for the 'Scramble for Africa'. For marks in Bands 1 and 2 (21–25; 18–20), examiners will look for an awareness of the involvement of countries other than Britain and for some appropriate examples. In 1870, little of Africa was controlled by European countries. By the end of the century, Liberia and Ethiopia were virtually the only independent areas. Power rivalries were an important factor. Britain saw empire, including Africa, as central to its power whereas Europe was much less vital. France regarded empire, especially in Africa, as a means of compensating for the defeat by Prussia in 1870–71. Germany was to seek a 'Place in the Sun'. Britain extended its hold on southern Africa and came into conflict with Germany, which took over south-west Africa. Rhodes led the movement into north and south Rhodesia. Karl Peters was his German equivalent. The discovery of gold and diamonds was a further impetus for colonialism and rivalry. Egypt provided a centre of tension between Britain, France and Germany. The Suez Canal was seen as vital to British interests further east, especially in India. French ambitions included Senegal, Algeria and the southern Sahara region. Italy had ambitions in Africa to reflect its claims to be a great power. Leopold of Belgium had a personal programme. Attempts to achieve an orderly expansion were made, notably by Bismarck at the Berlin Conference (1884–85), but with little success. Reluctant politicians became victims of popular support for African imperialism. Newspapers and literature, as well as convictions about Social Darwinism and religious duties, fed the hunger for empire. There was commercial expansion and rivalry in west Africa with hopes for the raw materials that were becoming more important to industry. There were searches for new markets and (unfulfilled) hopes that Africa might solve the perceived problem of over-population. The question is about causes and not results. Assessments of success and failure are not needed but might be referred to in conclusions.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

6 Why did World War I have important effects on Russia to October 1917?

The key issue is the consequences to October 1917 for Russia of World War I. The question asks 'Why?' and answers in Band 1 (21–25) will be analytical. Answers in Band 2 (18–20) should normally be mostly analytical. Band 5 (11–13) will need a basic understanding of the effects on Russia of the war. However, examiners should not undervalue answers that are chronological in structure. The condition of Russia in 1914 can be examined. Candidates might argue either that the problems faced by Nicholas II were very serious or that the regime was fundamentally stable. However, discussion of previous years, for example from the 1905 Revolution, should be kept in check so that the main emphasis is on the war years. Early victories were followed by heavier defeats. The battle of Tannenberg was disastrous for Russia. Arms were soon in short supply, making Russia's manpower ineffective. News of defeats and the suffering of soldiers could not be kept from the Russian population. Nicholas II's decision in 1915 to go to the front to take personal command worsened the situation. He had no military abilities and his removal from the centre of power weakened his position. The Tsarina Alexandra was unpopular and increasingly under the malign influence of Rasputin. From 1916, the number of strikes and military mutinies increased. The effects of sharp inflation were severe. Food was in short supply, not because of low production but because of the inadequacy of the railways when priority was given (inefficiently) to the war effort. Political instability was reflected in the rapid turnover of ministers, each equally incapable (4 prime ministers, 6 ministers of domestic affairs, 3 war ministers and 3 foreign ministers). The February 1917 Revolution was the first climax but not the end of the effects of the war. Kerensky and the Provisional Government decided to continue the war as a matter of honour. The events from February to October unfolded against the background of the war. The Provisional Government faced the same problems as had Nicholas II. It did not provide better leadership and was weakened by the war. A different dimension was provided by Lenin and the Bolsheviks who had been surprised in February.

7 How far was Mussolini a 'totalitarian' ruler of Italy to 1939?

The key issue is whether Mussolini was a totalitarian ruler. Credit should be given when this term is specifically discussed. The question does not ask whether Mussolini was as totalitarian as Hitler and Stalin but brief comparisons can be given credit. Totalitarianism implies a complete dictatorship beyond political autocracy: control of the political system, economic structures, cultural and religious dominance. It was based on the rule of the single leader. (Mussolini was described as the Duce.) Single party government followed the withdrawal of the opposition in the Aventine Secession. In 1925, his personal power was confirmed. Opposition suffered persecution, including the murder of Matteotti. Independent trade unions were banned. Local officials were appointed rather than elected or nominated by independents. Special courts were used for political offences. Censorship was imposed. The economy was run in the interests of the state. Reference might be made to the corporate state. On the other hand, candidates can argue that the police system and persecution were not complete. Underground newspapers and other writing survived. State control of the economy resulted in partially effective policies. Private industries continued, winning the support of industrialists who were protected. Policy alone could not make a success of the 'Battles' that Mussolini announced. The Lateran Treaties (1929) recognised the popularity and power of the Papacy. Mussolini got the better terms in the agreement but the settlement recognised that his power was not complete. Mussolini was not the head of state. Italy was still a monarchy although Victor Emmanuel III played little part after Mussolini's initial installation in 1922 following the March on Rome. His role in Mussolini's fall took place too late to be relevant unless mentioned briefly in a conclusion. There is no need to discuss foreign policy and any discussion that is included should be linked to the key issue. It might be argued that he saw foreign intervention and expansion as reflections of his own glory although the policies were also popular in Italy by 1939.

Page 12	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

8 Which of Bismarck and Marx had the greater effect on Europe to 1914?

The key issue is the comparison of the influence of Bismarck and Marx. Examiners will expect some balance but strongly argued cases with 70:30 balance might deserve Band 1 (21–23) although 60:40 would be more normal. Band 5 (11–13) will need a basic understanding of one. Most answers are likely to be sequential and examiners will not undervalue such responses as long as they make valid comparisons at some point. The tendency in moderate and weak answers might be to be heavily descriptive, offering accounts of Bismarck's career and Marx's ideas without examining their influence. Sections on Bismarck might also end in 1871 and be no more than accounts of German unification. This alone will find it difficult to get to Band 5. Bismarck's unification of Germany was very important and is relevant but candidates need to point out the strength of the new German empire. His influence after 1871 is in the syllabus and candidates can be expected to understand how he made Germany a foremost international power. They might judge that he laid the foundations of future international tensions, especially because of his treatment of France, although he sought to build alliances that would safeguard peace. Germany's domestic policies reinforced conservative authorities. Marx's 'Communist Manifesto' was published in 1848. 'Das Kapital' began publication in 1867. In France and Germany his ideas appealed to political radicals (but not as much in Britain and some might refer to Russia). They played a part in the 1848 French Revolution and a more important role after the war with Prussia, for example in the Paris Commune. In France and Germany, trade unions and left-wing political thinkers were much influenced. On the other hand, it can be claimed that the sum of Marx's influence by 1900 was limited. The question is about Europe to 1914. This will allow candidates to consider the lead-up to World War I and the condition of Russia in 1914 but discussions of Lenin and the 1917 Revolution in Russia will not be relevant unless included in a conclusion.