

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

9697 HISTORY

9697/11

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

'France was more responsible than Germany for the tensions between them from 1870 to 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	Article in a popular British magazine.	Germany has set up an extensive spy network that is a serious threat to France. This seriously risks war.	Y – This might possibly be seen as the most independent of the sources although Britain was an ally of France (loose in 1910). 'my beloved France' shows the writer's sympathies. N – The writer might be embroidering the situation for the readers of a popular magazine. Y/N – Germany did employ spies but so did all other major countries.	Y – Reference to the 'War of Revenge' is similar to B and C. Y – D confirms the German threat. N – B, C and D blame France for the tensions.	Y – The pre-war tensions between France and Germany were apparent in many ways. Y – There were strong feelings in France for revenge for the 1870 defeat.

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

B	Extract from a book written by a German general.	France harbours thoughts of revenge since the 1870 defeat by Prussia. Therefore, France has created an anti-German alliance, strengthened its army, and outstripped Germany colonially.	Y – France was embittered since the 1870 defeat. Y – France saw its alliance with Britain and France as primarily anti-German. Y – France was becoming stronger in the early 20th century. N – War was not inevitable in 1912. N – The writer's German sympathies are evident.	Y – A partly confirms French animosity to Germany. Y – B French public opinion might cause war. Y – E France attacked Germany first. N – Most of A sees Germany as more responsible. N – D Germany began military action.	Y – The repeated reference to revenge for 1870 is enlarged by convincing claims about France's wish for recognition as a great power and to regain Alsace-Lorraine. Y – Anti-German sentiment was the sole reason for France's alliances. Y – France was becoming stronger in the early 20th century. There were fears in Germany about this. N – The resolution of previous crises between France and Germany, e.g. Morocco, shows that war was not inevitable.
C	Report by a French diplomat to his government.	The French diplomat reports that Germany sees France as the most serious danger. A public demand for war forces Germany to take steps for its defence.	Y – This might be seen as a surprising report from a French diplomat, showing Germany on the defensive. Y – Germany did see France as the greatest danger in 1913. Y – It recognises the volatility of French public opinion. Y/N – German opinion about a war was divided in 1913.	Y – B supports the claim that France is very anti-German. Y – B agrees that the 1870 defeat was a decisive reason for the hostile French foreign policy. Y – E claims that France began hostilities. N – A sees Germany as primarily responsible. N – D claims that France began hostilities.	Y – Germany feared French public opinion. Y – The effects of French public opinion in sparking off the 1870 war were real.

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

D	Speech by the French Prime Minister to his Parliament.	Germany suddenly and unscrupulously attacked a peaceful France.	Y – The factual details about German military activity are probably correct. Y – Germany did have plans to go to war with France. N – The writer wished to secure support from his Parliament.	Y – A agrees that the German spy network threatened war. N – B points to France's long-term ambitions against Germany. N – France was less peaceful than Germany. N – E claims that France began hostilities.	Y – Germany had long prepared plans for an attack on France e.g. the Schlieffen Plan.
E	Speech by the German Chancellor.	France had been evasive about its wish for peace. France began first military action against Germany.	Y – The Russian alliance was important to France. Y – The factual details about French military activity are probably correct. N – The writer wished to secure support for German policies.	Y – B describes many aspects of France's hostile plans against Germany. Y – C agrees that French public opinion might cause a war. N – A sees Germany as mostly responsible because of its spy network which destabilised relations. N – D claims that Germany began hostilities.	Y – Germany felt seriously threatened by France. Y – Only a small group of German soldiers had invaded France and against orders. N – There was no real hope that France would remain neutral in a war between Germany and Russia. N – The responsibility for beginning military action is not completely clear but it is more probable that Germany was primarily responsible.

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.

For example, they will not discuss *'France was more responsible than Germany for the tensions between them from 1870 to 1914'* 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 not true that France was more responsible than Germany for the tensions between them from 1870 to 1914.' Germany was mostly to blame. Source A shows that Germany had built up an extensive and dangerous network of spies against France. Source D agrees, stating that, unlike France, Germany was responsible for the war. Its plans for war had been prepared over a long period and its claim to be peace-loving was false. Germany unleashed a sudden and unscrupulous series of military actions against France, supported by other steps against French communications. The German Ambassador, who would be speaking on behalf of his government, had not denied this.'

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 France was more responsible than Germany for the tensions between them from 1870 to 1914. On the other hand, Source B shows that France had pursued anti-German policies since its defeat by Prussia in 1870. Its desire for revenge led to the formation of a dangerous anti-German alliance with Russia and Britain. As France became stronger, it caused tensions that would certainly lead to war. Source C refers to public opinion in France. The general population wanted revenge for 1870 and might well force the French government to go to war. Source E claims that France had begun the war after it had refused to be neutral in any war between Germany and Russia. Germany had only invaded French borders once, and then by soldiers who were acting against orders. However the French had mounted a series of large-scale attacks on Germany.'

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	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 to conclude that Germany was more responsible than France for the tensions between them from 1870 to 1914. The writer of Source A was not completely neutral and confessed his sympathies with France. He was also writing for a popular magazine and might have exaggerated affairs for his readers. However, his description of an active German spy network can be mostly believed. The writer of Source B was a German general who asserted that war was certain. Therefore, it follows that it would be in German interests not to be surprised suddenly by the outbreak of hostilities. In addition, his statements about the French wish for revenge for the 1870 war are accurate. France had spent the period since 1870 nursing a grudge. France wished not only to regain its place as a major power but also to regain Alsace-Lorraine, which had been seized by the new Germany. Alliances with Russia and Britain were designed primarily to gain support for a war against Germany. Source C is interesting because it is by a French diplomat, who would probably not have exaggerated Germany's wish for peace. However, he reports statements that Germany feared that French public opinion might cause a war and it is true that the reaction of the French population had been a factor causing the 1870 war. Source E is justified in claiming that fear of Russia had been the key factor in the decision to mobilise the German army.'

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 France was more responsible than Germany for the tensions between them from 1870 to 1914. Although written by a German general, its description of strong anti-German feeling in France is true. This remained one of the strongest features of French foreign policy after 1870. German fears of growing French power were also true. In 1912, Germany feared that it would be overtaken by France and France's allies. The claim in Source C about the volatility of French public opinion is also true. France was a democracy where governments could be influenced strongly by public opinion. Source E reveals a deeply held fear in Germany of a military alliance between France and Russia. This formed the background of the Schlieffen Plan, which was designed to knock out France before it could aid Russia and force Germany to fight on two fronts.'

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

- 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]

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 France was more responsible than Germany for the tensions between them from 1870 to 1914, the stronger claim is that Germany was more responsible. Whilst French policy was anti-German, German policy was more aggressive. William II advocated Weltpolitik, an expansion of German interests abroad. Bismarck, who had favoured a peaceful and limited foreign policy after 1871, was dismissed because the Kaiser believed that he was too cautious. The Kaiser embarked on a number of dangerous ventures, of which more active measures against France were only a part. Taken together, Sources A and D, although they are in a minority compared to Sources B, C and E, are better explanations why there were tensions between France and Germany from 1870. Source B shows that a German general, who was probably not an exception among important German officials, believing in the inevitability of war. This is not shown in any of the pro-French sources. It is true that French public opinion was anti-German, as shown in Source C, but this had been the case since 1870 and war had not broken out before. Source D is more reliable than Source E because, whilst there were minor incursions on German territory by French soldiers as claimed in Source E, this did not compare with the extent of the German military actions described in Source D. The reliability of both Sources D and E is doubtful because the speakers were trying to convince their audiences and justify their governments' positions. However, the factual basis of Source D is probably better.'

OR

...the stronger claim is that France was more responsible. Although Source A is correct in its description of the German spy network, all countries employed spies before World War I. The extract is therefore very one-sided and ignores French responsibility. The claims about a desire for revenge in Source B are confirmed in Source A and Source C. The growing economic and military power of France in the early twentieth century worried Germany. Source C's claim that French public opinion was more pro-war than German public opinion is probably true, although some politicians and military generals saw war as desirable. The point in Source E about the decisive effect of Russian mobilisation is valid. This began the series of events that turned tensions between France and Germany into war. The Schlieffen Plan did not promote war but only stated how a war should be fought. In any case, all countries, including France, had their war plans.'

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 both France and Germany were responsible for the growing tensions. France wished for revenge after the defeat by Prussia in 1870 and this priority shaped its foreign policy afterwards until World War I. Germany, under Kaiser William II, pursued reckless policies that disturbed the balance of power. These tensions were only part of the situation that led to the outbreak of war in 1914 but neither country would moderate its position. The different opinions in Sources D and E about which country actually began military activity are less important than the fact that both countries were willing to go to war to defeat the other.'

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

Section B

2 Why was Louis XVI executed in 1793?

The key issue is the reasons for Louis XVI's execution. The question asks 'Why?' and candidates should provide a series of reasons. Most candidates can be expected to begin in 1789. It will be difficult to make material before 1789 relevant. Some might take a narrower approach with the rise of the Jacobins. As always, the main criterion in assessment will be the quality of the argument. The question can be tackled chronologically. It is easy to underestimate the support for Louis XVI in 1789. The decision to convene the Estates General was popular. The number of republicans was negligible. Nevertheless, his popularity continued to decline until his execution at a time when few monarchists in France dared to protest. Louis' personality can be examined. He was well-meaning but lacked political skills. He had a strong sense of duty and monarchical obligation. He believed in divine right. Together, these made him reluctant to accept the (comparatively moderate) reforms that were demanded, such as the issue of voting in the Estates General, the August Decrees and Declaration of Rights, until he was forced into concessions, which consequently made him less, not more, popular. His defence of privileged classes was an important factor. He held out against the Civil Constitution. There were suspicions, not wholly unfounded, that he was angling for foreign intervention to regain power. The King was seen as sympathetic to the émigrés. Whatever the truth about Marie Antoinette's attitudes and actions, she was widely hated. The ill-fated flight to Varennes can be examined. It will be very relevant to show how extremists hijacked the Revolution. The dangers from war, internal unrest as in the Vendée, and economic pressures led to the victory of extremists such as Robespierre and the defeat of moderate revolutionary forces. Louis' execution was important in its own right but it was also a reflection of rivalries between different groups of radicals.

3 How important were the political effects of the Industrial Revolution on Britain and France to the mid-nineteenth century?

The key issues are the political effects of the Industrial Revolution in two countries, with the mid-nineteenth century as the end point. Band 5 (11–13) will need a basic understanding of the effects on one country, probably Britain. However, even the best answers do not need to show an even balance between Britain and France. The focus should be clear to deserve credit and factors that are discussed need to be linked to political issues. The Industrial Revolution gave an impetus to the size of the urban working class and the middle class. It also changed the position of those traditional landowners who could not adapt. By the mid-nineteenth century, the middle classes were becoming more influential in Britain. They were given the vote in 1832 and were able to influence government policies in favour of free trade and the end of protection for agriculture. The urban workers gained fewer benefits; their political gains really expanded in the later nineteenth century, after the end of the question. However, pressures and fears of unrest persuaded governments to introduce legislation to ameliorate working and housing conditions. There were fears of radicalism, for example in Chartism. On the other hand, the landowning classes retained influence, dominating government at central and local levels. In France, less industrialisation by 1850 necessarily brought fewer political changes but there is evidence of some developments that are linked to the political situation. Industrial workers and the middle classes contributed to the revolutions of 1830 and especially 1848. Louis Philippe tried to please the bourgeoisie but was mostly unsuccessful. Traditional groups retained power. The lesser extent of changes reflected the preference of the upper classes to depend on land and offices rather than the gains from industrial investment.

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

4 Who of Cavour, Garibaldi and Mazzini contributed most to the unification of Italy?

The key issue is the comparative contributions of three leaders of Italian unification. Band 5 (26–28) will need a basic understanding of the work of one man. However, even the best answers do not need to show an even balance between the three. Candidates can spend most time on their preferred choice but answers in the two highest bands will need a sound knowledge and understanding of all three. There is a comparative element in the question ('contributed...most') and answers in Band 1 (21–25) will be clear when offering their reasons. Answers in lower bands might be relevant, well informed and clearly argued but they will probably not justify their choice. A problem might be when candidates interpret the question as an invitation to write about only one leader – the most important. These answers might show the candidates to be capable of writing well but they will be incomplete. Such answers might be limited to a ceiling in Band 3 (16–17) although, as always, the overriding factor will be the quality of the argument. Cavour laid a firm foundation for unification by re-organising Piedmont. He was a successful politician who managed Piedmont with a combination of skill and bribery. He was a realist and ensured that he obtained foreign assistance, especially from Napoleon III's France, before confronting Austria. He preferred to extend Piedmont's influence by plebiscites, apparently democratic but actually carefully managed. It might be argued that unification went further than he intended but his acceptance of Garibaldi's gains in the south confirmed his pragmatism and he was careful not to confront the Papacy. By the time of his death (1861), Italy was unified with the exceptions of Venetia and Rome. Garibaldi made his name in Italy and outside by his contribution to the failed revolutions of 1848–49. He did as much as anybody to popularise the cause of Italian unification. The 1860 invasion of the south was successful militarily and had knock-on effects by forcing Cavour to recognise the momentum of pressure for a larger Italy. Although his later career was less successful, his particular claims were to push for the unification of the peninsula as a whole and to win the support of the lower orders. Mazzini led the cause in the 1830s and 1840s, for example through the Carbonari and the 1848–49 revolutions. It might be claimed that his ideas were unrealistic: a secular democracy achieved by Italians alone. However, although he was to be less successful in practical terms than either Cavour or Garibaldi, his claim to have been the most important contributor depends largely on the way in which he began the struggle. Except for the monarchy, the final shape of Italy closely resembled his programme.

5 How far did European countries achieve their aims in the 'New Imperialism' by 1900? (You should refer to Britain and at least one other European country in your answer.)

The key issue is the achievement of aims in the 'New Imperialism'. Candidates should note the need to include references to Britain and at least one other country. This is to discourage vague responses. However, the quality of arguments will be paramount and answers do not need to be evenly balanced between the two or more countries that are used as illustrations. Nor will marks necessarily depend on the number of countries referred to, although more numerous references might reflect wider understanding. Answers might be organised in two ways. Some might structure essays according to the issues: political, strategic, economic, social etc. and then consider how far countries achieved these aims. Alternatively, candidates might deal with countries in turn. How far did Britain achieve its aims, then, for example, France? Both structures can lead to high marks. 'How far..?' should encourage candidates to assess success and failure. There might be a tendency to concentrate on failure. Britain did gain political power and prestige but imperialism also resulted in political problems, for example increasing rivalry with Germany and France. Empire-building was popular in some European countries but the political advantages by 1900 were questionable. There were economic benefits for some countries although they were not as great as contemporaries claimed. The economic benefits of a number of German and French acquisitions were dubious. Generally, imperial possessions might yield raw materials but did not provide large markets. The argument that New Imperialism offered opportunities for surplus investment is now largely discounted. It will be relevant to consider which country/countries gained most. Britain's empire was the foundation of its world power and continental countries did not emulate this. It will be possible to reach Band 1 (21–25) by looking only at imperialism in Africa but answers that show a wider awareness of empire-building, for example in Asia might achieve this more easily. For example, European experiences in China were very mixed.

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

6 Examine the view that the opposition to Nicholas II in Russia had achieved little by 1914.

The key issue is the effectiveness of opposition to Nicholas II by 1914. The end point is clear. Discussions of the effects of war after 1914 and the 1917 Revolution will not be relevant unless referred to briefly in a conclusion. Nicholas II became Tsar in 1894 but the 1905 Revolution can serve as an appropriate starting point for answers. This revolution was arguably the most significant rising before 1917. Strikes broke out in many parts of Russia. There was discontent among the peasantry and urban classes. The middle classes were discontented. The Potemkin incident showed that the navy was disaffected. Bloody Sunday in St Petersburg was a major event. However, the opposition to Nicholas II's regime was weakened by its divisions. Nationalists, liberals and socialists had different programmes. In the end, a combination of force and the promise of political concessions defeated the opposition. The period to 1914 showed the limited success of the Duma and political reformers. Stolypin's reforms, which included the encouragement of the kulak class, brought some stability to the economy. Foreign loans bolstered the economy. The minister also aimed to increase religious toleration, extend education and reform local administration to allow some decentralisation. Although it can be argued that his success was limited, the greatest opposition to his policies came from within the regime not from outside. Revolutionaries, including Lenin's Bolsheviks, had little success. They were curbed by a police system with many of the leaders in internal or external exile. There were still signs of unrest, including strikes that were put down forcefully (for example the Lena Gold Fields Massacre, 1912) but they did little to shake the government. By 1914 Nicholas II's autocracy was still intact and there were few signs of imminent change, even less a revolution that would bring down the monarchy.

7 Why was Stalin able to establish his dictatorship in Russia?

The key issue is Stalin's establishment of his dictatorship. Stalin used his position as General Secretary of the Communist Party to control appointments, even during Lenin's last years when the latter became less active. As General Secretary, Stalin managed the complete structure of the administration and therefore government from the lowest to the highest posts. It is possible that Lenin and Trotsky planned to remove Stalin but Lenin's death gave Stalin his opportunity. He outwitted Trotsky and represented himself as Lenin's heir. Stalin would use allies to gain power, for example Kamenev, Zinoviev and Bukharin. Trotsky was hounded out and critics, or those who were accused of opposing Stalin, were persecuted as Trotskyites. He was then ruthless in destroying those who had helped him to achieve his autocratic position. A succession of purges culminated in the show trials of 1936–38. The purges involved not only political figures but people from many fields, including the military. The Communist Party was decimated and the officer class in the army, navy and air force suffered similarly. The effect of this was to increase Stalin's dictatorship beyond all previously known bounds in Russia. The NKVD was given targets that were out of proportion with any real opposition. At the same time, propaganda conveyed the image of a genial and successful leader who was responsible for all of the USSR's (often exaggerated) achievements. Russian history was studied through books which were attributed to Stalin (for example, the 'Short Course in the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union'). Radio and newspapers underlined Stalin's reputation. Candidates can deal with a variety of social and economic policies but these need to be linked to dictatorship. For example, the Five-Year Plans were drawn up to meet Stalin's demands but they should be linked to the way in which they underpinned his dictatorship. Collectivisation and the destruction of the kulaks had some ideological basis but more importantly they represented Stalin's insistence on control.

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

8 Which of Nationalism and Marxism was the greater danger to governments before

The key issue is the comparative danger to governments from Nationalism and Marxism. Because these topics are wide and complex and examiners will bear this in mind when assessing answers. It might be more common to read two successive accounts with a comparative introduction or conclusion. Band 5 (11–13) will require an adequate understanding and knowledge of one of the factors. Although it can be argued that nationalism emerged during the French Revolution, candidates are not expected to show knowledge of all of the period from 1789 to 1914. They can choose salient developments. However, 1914 is the given end point and discussions of post-revolutionary Russia or nationalism during the 1930s cannot be given credit. It is possible to argue that both factors were disruptive although both were intended to remedy grievances. European governments in the early nineteenth century believed that nationalism was a dangerous effect of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic empire. One of the major concerns of most of the major powers was to limit it, for example in the Congress of Vienna and through the internal and external policies of Metternich. Rulers in Italy and Germany felt threatened. Prominent among the extreme results of nationalism were the 1848 Revolutions and, although the threat seemed to have been overcome in 1859, it actually continued until the unification of Germany and Italy in 1870–71. Some might be aware of the prevalence of nationalism in tsarist Russia. The tsars had to decide how to deal with the disparate groups within the Russian empire. Mostly they adopted a policy of coercion but some reforming ministers such as Stolypin advocated concessions. Some candidates might link nationalism to Imperialism; overseas expansion was a powerful sign of national power. Others might use their knowledge of the causes of World War I to discuss Balkan nationalism. Marxism emerged from the writings of Marx, complemented by Engels. The 'Communist Manifesto' was published in 1848 and the first volume of 'Das Kapital' in 1867. Marxism taught the fundamental importance of economic systems. Capitalism would be replaced by communist socialism as the industrial proletariat supplanted the bourgeoisie. Such ideas were thought dangerous by governments and governing classes. There was some evidence of Marxist influence in the 1848 revolutions in France and Germany. Later Bismarck perceived the danger to the new German Empire. Marxists were also linked to instability in France, for example in the Paris Commune. In Russia, the Marxists, especially Lenin's Bolsheviks, were persecuted by the tsarist government. Britain was less affected by Marxism although it was a highly industrialised country.