

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 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 October/November 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 – October/November 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 – October/November 2011	9697

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

SOURCE-BASED QUESTION: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

'From 1906 to 1914, Britain was determined to side with France against Germany.' 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	Memorandum by the British Foreign Minister.	Y – Grey indicates the compelling reasons for Britain's support of France although the consequences of a general war will be terrible.	Y – Grey was a leading minister. Y – His description of French reactions if Britain did not give support is valid. N? – He might have exaggerated the public's attachment to France in 1906.	Y – D agrees that Britain will be on France's side if war breaks out. Y/N – E has some contradictions. At first, it claims that Britain would support France but later it expresses uncertainty about British support. N – A, C and D are each views by Grey. Although an important figure in the British government, he might not be expressing the opinion of the British government as a whole. N – C Grey seems to contradict his views in A. N – B does not see the Entente as involving obligations. But Crowe might be expressing a personal opinion. N – E mostly does not support the claim.	The Entente Cordiale (1904) resolved tensions between Britain and France. Events such as the Morocco crises (1905–6 and 1911) brought the countries closer together. The Triple Entente, including Russia, was another step although again it was not a formal treaty. However, British attitudes to France were probably less friendly than A claims.

B	Memorandum by a British senior civil servant.	N – The Entente of Britain and France was not a formal treaty with obligations. It might be meaningless in an emergency.	Y – The Entente was not a treaty. It settled some territorial differences with France but made no commitments if war broke out. N – The source probably underestimates relations between Britain and France. Events proved that the Entente was not meaningless.	Y – D sees no alternative to supporting France if war breaks out. N – B contradicts the claim that Britain had to support France. It minimises Britain's commitments. N – Grey is more non-committal than in A. Y/N – E is indecisive. Grey states that Britain would not be neutral but spends more time explaining issues that might prevent Britain from supporting France.	It is true that the Dual Entente was not a formal treaty with specific commitments by either country. However, it reflected close relations with France as relations with Germany deteriorated. The source reflects British policy that was unclear to many, including France and Germany. Grey might be described either as statesmanlike or indecisive.
C	Report to his government by the German Ambassador to Britain.	N – Grey stated that Britain had no formal obligations to France. However, there had been military discussions. British policy was to maintain peace. He did not specify what Britain would do if war broke out.	Y – C is probably an accurate version of the Ambassador's conversation with Grey. Y – C expresses clearly Grey's evasive, or non-committal, attitude. N – It is a second-hand version of British policy. The Ambassador might have been selective in his account.	Y – B agrees that Britain did not have firm commitments to France. The implications of the 'conversations' are unclear but Grey distances them from commitments. Y – C The Ambassador's comment about serious consequences of military conversations is valid. Y – E does not give any guarantees of support to France. N – A contradicts C. N – The overall thrust of D expresses (reluctant?) support of France.	Grey tries to make a distinction between formal treaty agreements and 'conversations'. This might be considered evasive.

D	Report by the British Foreign Minister to his government.	Y – Britain would be involved on France's side if war broke out. Y – The two alternative outcomes of war would mean that Britain would suffer if France did not win. N – Grey's support for France is not enthusiastic.	Y – D again is a statement by the British Foreign Minister. Y – His analysis of relations in Europe and consequences for Britain is convincing.	Y – A agrees that there is a close relationship between Britain and France and that Britain would be involved on France's side if war broke out. Y/N – E briefly agrees but contains many reservations about support for France. Belgium, not France, might be crucial. N – B and C disagree that Britain has a commitment.	The roles of the Triple Alliance and Triple Entente are explained as well as the consequences for Britain of a war involving other countries. Grey summarises the consequences of a war if Britain is not on the winning side.
E	Report by the French Ambassador to Britain to his government.	Y – Britain could not remain neutral if war broke out. N – British public opinion was hostile to war. N – Economic issues were against war. N – Parliament's attitude had to be taken into account.	Y – E is probably an accurate version of the conversation with Grey. Y – The source shows the different opinions in Britain. N – Britain's attitude to France and Germany is explained indirectly. N – France was anxious to secure British support which is not obvious in the source. The Ambassador might have been explaining his fears rather than all of the conversation.	Y – A agrees that Britain would be on France's side in a war. Y – D sees Britain's involvement in a war on France's side. N – B and C deny firm commitments to France. Y/N – E might be seen to have contradictory views.	The various pressures for and against British intervention and support for France can be expanded. Britain was very conscious of trade interests. It is true that there was little British interest in the Balkans crisis but Belgian independence would involve France. Support for France might be necessary to save Belgium.

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 – October/November 2011	9697

1 Source-Based Question

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

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 *'From 1906 to 1914, Britain was determined to side with France against Germany'* 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, *'Source A agrees that from 1906 to 1914, Britain was determined to side with France against Germany. The Entente bound Britain to France and a wide section of the population supported France. Although the consequences of war would be terrible, France would feel betrayed and the British population would agree if Britain did not support France. Source D agrees. It would be both unwise and dangerous if Britain did not support France. The results for Britain if it did not support France would be devastating whichever country won the 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 from 1906 to 1914, Britain was determined to side with France against Germany. [In addition to L2], On the other hand, Source B does not support the hypothesis. The writer denies that the Entente is a formal treaty with France. It makes no obligations on Britain and might be valueless in an emergency, such as war. Source C also denies that Britain had a formal commitment to support France. The same writer in Source E gave no guarantees to France.'*

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, *'The sources can also be interpreted to show that from 1906 to 1914, Britain was not determined to side with France against Germany. Source A does say that British policy and public opinion supported France since the Entente had been agreed. However, this was written in 1906 and Grey's later statements in Sources C and E are less straightforward. He is hesitant in Source C and denies a close involvement with France although he admits that there had been military conversations between Britain and France. Source E contains a brief statement that Britain would not be neutral in the event of war but most of the extract shows the difficulties of committing Britain to France. Grey was a key minister, being responsible for foreign affairs and we know that he had a considerable influence on British policy. In Source B, Crowe issues a*

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697

clear denial that Britain was determined to support France. Although he was a servant, he was not necessarily objective in his memorandum but we know that there were feelings in Britain towards France and the possibility of war in 1911. The Entente did not remove completely the old distrust of France while some wished to keep out of continental engagements.

- 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 conformation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example, (L4 plus) *'On the other hand, Crowe, the writer of Source B did not make British policy. He was only an adviser. In Source C, Grey might have been trying to reassure the German Ambassador that Britain was not hostile. He is more convincing in Source D where he accepts that Britain would find it difficult not to be involved on France's side in a war. He might not have been enthusiastic but the alternative to non-involvement was worse.'*

- L6 AS L5, PLUS EITHER (a) EXPLAINS 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 in the question, the argument that Britain was determined to side with France against Germany is more convincing. The danger from Germany became more apparent while France did not represent a direct threat to Britain. The sources do not show that Britain was eager to support France but that ministers found it necessary. Source C denies absolute commitments but the reference to its opposition to aggression was clearly anti-German. France did not seem to be an aggressor in 1914 while German ambitions and policies were aggressive. The Entente referred to in Source A changed British policy although there were still problems in gaining public support. Source A claims that public support was fully pro-French while Source E claims that public opinion did not want Britain to go to war. Source D is the key source showing that ultimately British interests would have to support France.'*

OR

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 British policy towards France was confused during the period from 1906 to 1914. Grey's statements in Sources A and C seem to point towards firm support for France. However, the tone of the messages that he gave to the German and French Ambassadors in Sources D and E show hesitation and the lack of a clear line of policy. Source B shows misgivings on the part of others but is less important. Taken as a whole, these sources show the lack of clarity in British policy. Their mixed messages reveal uncertainty in Britain. Some historians have judged that this uncertainty contributed to the outbreak of a general European war and that Germany might have hesitated before going to war with France if it was sure that Britain would be involved.'*

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

Section B

2 Explain the rise and fall of the Jacobins in France during the period from 1789 to 1794.

The Jacobins developed as a group soon after the outbreak of the French Revolution. At first, they were liberals who wanted a constitutional monarchy but not a republic. Robespierre emerged from a minority of radicals. One reason for their rise was effective organisation. Jacobin clubs soon spread throughout most of the provinces. The Jacobins themselves split. After Louis XVI's Flight to Varennes, some did not want the King to be deposed but Robespierre headed a party that aimed for a republic. They found useful allies in the sans-culottes, who pressed for a republic. Robespierre and the Jacobins began by opposing a foreign war. They had no confidence that the revolution had an appeal to foreigners. This changed when France itself was seriously threatened by foreign invasion from monarchists. Robespierre himself was a powerful speaker, using his training as a lawyer. He had a reputation for honesty – the 'Incorruptible'. His ruthless determination contributed to his rise when France was falling into disorder. He had a clear programme that contrasted with the compromises favoured by others. He was also a skilful politician, able (until the end) to gauge public opinion. He dominated the Committee of Public Safety, using it to remove rivals such as the Girondins, Hébert and Danton. The 'Terror' (1792–94) was adopted not only because he thought it necessary but because it was popular with fearful revolutionaries in France. Robespierre's fall was sudden. Extreme innovations such as the Republic of Virtue and the Cult of the Supreme Being resulted in more opponents than supporters. By 1794, the worst dangers to the revolution seemed over. Counter-revolutionary risings within France, for example the Vendée, had been suppressed. Foreign threats from Austria, Britain and Prussia were contained. The continuation of Terror finally turned people against Robespierre and his supporters.

3 Assess the claim that the most important cause of the Industrial Revolution was the development of steam power. (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The question requires candidates to refer to at least two countries. They might refer to each of the three that are mentioned but three countries will not necessarily be more creditable than two. As always, the criterion will be the quality of the argument. The case for steam power rests largely on the development of machinery in large factories and the role of steam in communications, especially the railways but also some might refer to steam ships. Steam made for mass production and for quicker production. It enabled railways to move around raw materials and finished products. More passengers were carried than horse-drawn carriages could cope with. Railways allowed both a greater concentration of resources in towns and more rapid travel between sources and outlets. Some might trace steam back to the use of coal as fuel, replacing charcoal, water and primitive manpower. Among other factors that might be considered is capitalism or the money available for investment. At the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, much depended on individual investors such as Matthew Boulton. By the end of the nineteenth century, industrialisation depended on big banks and major finance houses such as the Rothschilds. The adoption of limited liability companies helped to minimise risks and make investment more attractive. The growth of populations provided manpower and larger markets. Some candidates might consider the role of agricultural improvements. The Agricultural Revolution in Britain, followed by similar changes later in France and Germany, provided more food, which both had an impact on population growth and reduced the need for a workforce in the countryside. This resulted in a movement to other places of employment, usually in industry. The question asks about the most important contribution. Answers in Band 1 should address the issue of priority whereas lesser answers might only provide lists.

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

4 Why was Bismarck more successful than the Liberals in unifying Germany?

Candidates can begin their answers at one of several points. Some might focus narrowly on the period from 1862, beginning with the budget dispute with the Liberals. Others might take the argument from 1848–49. Another alternative will be to begin in 1815. Any of these approaches might lead to a very good answer. Answers in Band 1 should reflect a reasonable balance. A split of 60:40, usually expected in Bismarck's favour, can merit any mark but a succinct yet persuasive discussion with less of a balance might deserve a very high reward. Band 5 will need an understanding of one, presumably Bismarck. Liberalism was always a minority cause in Germany, more popular among the middle classes. Liberals lacked the political weight of the ruling orders, especially the Junkers. High credit should be given to answers that note the distinction between Liberalism and Nationalism. Liberalism was not a clearly defined programme that aimed at German unification. It opposed authoritarianism but some Liberals advocated state rights as the most desirable goal. From 1815 to 1848, Liberalism was restricted by the policies of most German princes, urged on by Metternich. The Carlsbad Decrees (1819) might be cited. In 1848, some rulers, including Frederick William IV of Prussia, made enough concessions to pacify the Liberals who were alarmed at popular disorder. The Frankfurt Parliament might be examined to underline the shortcomings of German Liberals. Bismarck came to power in 1862 because of the dispute between the Liberals and William I's government over money for the army. In unifying Germany, Bismarck had several advantages. He could use the army, especially when it was strengthened by Moltke and von Roon. He (usually) had the support of William I. Anti-Austrian feeling had become more general since 1848. Prussia was already the leading state in Germany, the only alternative as a leader to Austria, and its importance was underlined by the Zollverein. The Liberals lacked an effective leader. Whatever criticism might be made of Bismarck, he was effective. As Prussia expanded after the wars with Denmark, Austria and France, the Liberals either volunteered or were forced to support Bismarck. The constitutions of the North German Confederation and then the new German Empire had liberal provisions but really enforced Prussian and illiberal power.

5 How far do you agree that empires were more a luxury than a necessity for European countries in the late nineteenth century?

Examiners will not expect balanced answers e.g. 50% luxury: 50% necessity. Answers in Band 1 might be heavily skewed as long as candidates explain why the alternative is unacceptable. Countries developed empires largely for reasons of power and trade. Some politicians, for example Disraeli and Bismarck, were at first dubious about the advantages of imperialism but were won over later, mostly because of the pressure of public opinion. Britain as an island regarded overseas colonies, rather than European commitments, as the key to its power and prestige. France, for example Ferry, saw imperialism as the means to restore power after defeat in the Franco-Prussian War. Germany increasingly regarded empire as important to gain 'a place in the sun'. From 1890, William II advocated vigorous expansion. However, candidates might wonder how far the results achieved the aims. Many areas in Africa and Asia offered little real power. Economic motives included the search for raw materials and markets. Industrialised Europe needed cotton, rubber, and oils and wanted to obtain silks. These offered profits to manufacturers while the markets were alternative outlets for the over-production in Europe. In the event, profits were limited while Europe did not produce the goods that were widely needed in empires. Empires proved expensive. They needed large navies and involved military commitments. Imperialism was seen as an answer to over-population but most emigration went to America rather than to regions in Africa and Asia. Popular opinion was won over to imperialism largely because of the subjective and exaggerated propaganda of newspapers and literature. Some might consider Social Darwinism – the 'White Man's Burden'. The combination of religious evangelism and the advantages of European civilisation was seen as a duty in the later nineteenth century but this might be questioned by candidates. Answers in Bands 3+ should be able to support arguments with appropriate examples.

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

6 Why did the reforms of Witte and Stolypin not prevent a revolution in Russia in 1917?

Witte was Minister for Finance (1892–1903) and had other responsibilities, including communications and labour relations. He was behind the Trans-Siberian Railway, intended to improve Russian trade and open up Siberia. Although not completed until 1917, most of the construction had been completed early in the twentieth century. He believed that investment was needed to improve the Russian economy and was only available abroad. Hence, there was a reliance on foreign loans, especially from France. After the 1905 Revolution, he was bought back as Prime Minister, advising Nicholas II to call a Duma and adopt a more constitutional type of government. More foreign loans followed. However, his policies never enjoyed the confidence of the Tsar and he was soon dismissed. Stolypin, Prime Minister from 1906 to 1911, combined support for economic reform with hard-line politics. He encouraged the growth of the kulaks as a means of improving agriculture and increasing support for the Tsarist regime against the Liberals. He improved education and introduced a scheme of social insurance. Support for the Duma was balanced by a narrower franchise. ‘Stolypin’s necktie’ was harshly used to put down discontent. Like Witte, he was not supported by Nicholas II and there were those around the Tsar who believed that even Stolypin was too radical. This lack of support at the top was a key reason why reform failed. Candidates can explore other factors that resulted in revolution. They might consider Nicholas II’s personal responsibility and the effects of World War I. The 1905 Revolution was followed by broken promises and Nicholas II showed his absolutist tendencies in the Fundamental Laws that negated most of the October Manifesto. World War I did more than show the weakness of the Russian army. In an absolute monarchy, it revealed the Tsar’s shortcomings, especially when Nicholas II took personal command. By 1917, he had lost the confidence of most Russians. Candidates should note that the question ends in February 1917. Discussions of the Provisional Government and the October Revolution will not be relevant. The balance between Witte, Stolypin and other factors will depend on the direction of the argument but Band 5 will normally require a basic understanding of their policies.

7 How far had Stalin achieved his aims in domestic policies by 1939?

Answers in the highest bands will link aims and success clearly whereas other answers might deal with aims more briefly. Answers in Band 1 can normally be expected to be aware of limitations to reflect ‘How far?’ but this will depend on the arguments that are proposed. It can hardly be denied that Stalin achieved many of his aims but some might attempt to argue that he was wholly successful. The structure of answers might vary. Some might analyse his aims first and then deal with policies and success in successive paragraphs. Others might define an aim and then examine success. One aim was to gain personal power. Answers might show how this was established from 1924 to 1929 and consolidated to 1939. He removed rivals, first men such as Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev, then Bukharin and very possibly Kirov. The Great Purge of 1936–38 went further, to liquidate real or imagined enemies in the communist party and Red Army. The victims included those in the highest circles but then spread to others in the middle and lower groups. At the same time, propaganda portrayed Stalin as responsible for every success. Stalin wished to modernise Russia rapidly. He rightly claimed that Russia was fifty or a hundred years behind advanced countries and wanted to close the gap in ten years. The Five Year Plans (1928–32, 1933–37, 1938–42) were implemented ruthlessly. The emphasis was on heavy industry. Stalin was convinced that collectivisation was necessary if agricultural production was to be increased. The human costs were unimportant to him. Production increased in industry and agriculture but the most convincing answers will examine how far there was an improvement. Sympathetic contemporaries and historians accepted the official figures while many now see most of the claims as propaganda, although conceding that there were increases. Stalin’s preference for ‘socialism in one country’ led to an aversion to an active foreign policy. He was successful in keeping Russia safe from entanglements until 1939. Involvement in the Spanish Civil War was limited. Candidates might briefly refer to the consequences of his policies soon after 1939 but this is not needed in the question. It might be suitable only in a brief conclusion.

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

8 How far do you agree that the French Revolution of 1789 was more successful than the revolutions of 1848-49 in Italy?

The key issue is the comparison of success in the French and Italian revolutions. Examiners will expect a reasonably balanced treatment. A split of 60:40 either way can merit any mark, while 70:30 may well merit a ceiling one band lower than would otherwise be given. Band 5 will require an understanding of one of the revolutions. A focus on comparison can be expected in Band 1 but examiners will not undervalue answers that make comparative points in otherwise sequential explanations. The extent of support for the revolution in France was wider than in Italy. All France did not rise immediately but Paris was involved and soon many provinces were affected. In Italy, the risings were more sporadic. In France, although precise aims are difficult to define, there was a general disillusionment with the ancien régime. Support for the revolutions in Italy was more limited. Differences in aims can be explored. It would be an exaggeration to claim that the aims in France were clear-cut. The revolutionaries quarrelled between themselves. But the divisions were less than in Italy where there were monarchists and republicans, advocates of a unitary state and federalists. There was also a clear concept of France as a country whereas Metternich was not alone in regarding Italy as merely a geographical expression. There was significant anti-clericalism in France. The Italians still held the Pope in high regard, even after Pius IX's change from liberalism to reactionary policies. Perhaps most important, the French army proved incapable of dealing with the disorder and foreign intervention, although dangerous, failed to prop up Louis XVI on the throne. It made his position even weaker. In Italy, Austria's military strength was apparent against revolutionaries who could offer only disorganised violence. Louis Napoleon of France also played an important role. The establishment of the Roman Republic, led politically by Mazzini and militarily by Garibaldi, revealed the limitations of the revolutionaries' physical strength.