

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/23

Paper 2c (European History Outlines, c.1715–2000),
maximum raw mark 90

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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

1 'Badly governed at home and unsuccessful abroad.' Discuss this view of France either under the Regency or under Fleury.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present the response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are:

Regency. Management of the minority; the conflict between traditional advisers and professionals of the 'Colbert' type; the role of Regent and role of Parlement; Orleans was an able soldier and well educated but lazy and arguably lacking in principle; too many concessions to lawyers and nobles; there were no reforms but a degree of stability attained; there was a competent foreign policy under Dubois with peace and alliances; relations with Spain were finally sorted; the role of Law.

Fleury. He was able, a Richelieu type; he had a sound foreign policy, the Treaty of Vienna, for example, the 'negotiate not fight' approach; the Escorial Treaty and Family Compact; he was ruthless with opposition; there was some prosperity and economic growth, the work of Orry; he was arbitrary but conformist; he advised against the Seven Years War.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Both parts of the question should be challenged and the idea of 'misrule' and 'success' (in terms of foreign policy) should be considered. A good case each way is looked for.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

2 How effectively were the Habsburg lands ruled in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the rule surviving under Charles; his loss of territory – Belgrade, for example; his failure to reduce privilege; his lack of reform, be it military or economic; his regime was weak; his neglect of agriculture and education; he was the ‘artist not accountant’; there was a lack leadership under Charles, he had good advisers like Bartenstein but ignored them; weakness of both military and foreign policy, too concerned with Pragmatic Sanction; under Maria Theresa it was too conservative and Catholic possibly; there was the work of Bartenstein, Haugwitz, Kaunitz, their reforms; costly wars fought; the Hungarian problem; the work in Netherlands and Italy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some thinking of what ‘effective rule’ might involve in that part of the 18th century is looked for. Once a definition is considered, then a case each way is expected. It may well be that different conclusions are reached for Charles and Maria Theresa.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

3 Compare and contrast the contributions of Frederick William I and Frederick II to the development of Prussia.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: Frederick William I – the build-up of resources; the diplomacy with Austria and the Empire; establishing authority within the state; his development of the army; his finance, tax and excise; the Generalskriegskommissariat; his work on local government control and centralisation; his efforts overall, the guilds, management of the economy and the judiciary.

Frederick II – the autocrat and man of action; he was militaristic and hardworking; never a delegator; perhaps overconcerned with paper / administration; had limited success in economics; some sound work with industry and justice; perhaps obsessed with his army.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is ample scope here for a wide-ranging discussion. The best will look at the two in some perspective and get some real balance into the discussion, possibly differentiating between what they achieved for Prussia rather and just for the monarchy.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

4 How well ruled was Spain under the Bourbons in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: Philip: the role of the Church; his overall aims and ambitions; his management of Aragon and Castile; too dominated by Elizabeth; the good work of Alberoni on tax etc.; he was obsessed with dynastic factors; perhaps also the work of Ripperda.

Ferdinand: pacific; there were some limited reforms; the work of Patino.

Charles: competent and hardworking; there were quality ministers; he was enlightened and pro-industry; he supported the able Squillace; treatment of the Jesuits; his work in South America.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. An overview initially is looked for, with reflection on what might make a country 'well ruled' in the 18th century. Once the criteria are established, there is ample scope for a good case to be made each way. It was not all gloom / doom and decline.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

5 'The reign of Louis XV, after 1743, demonstrates all too clearly what was wrong with the ancien regime.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the system's overdependence on the character and failings of monarchs; foreign policy provided a good example of flaws; too concerned with hunting and women; he was indecisive and bored with affairs of state; tolerant of factions; made ministerial instability into a principle of government; allowed struggles over religion and finance; his mis / management of Jansenism issues; his management of Parlement; his mismanagement of money / taxation etc.; allowed the growth of a privileged versus unprivileged struggle; tolerated rigid industrial processes and office holding; clung on to Divine Right ideas.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is a possible case against, but it could take some developing. The main focus should be on identifying the flaws in the ancien régime, ideally prioritising them, and demonstrating how well, or otherwise, the latter part of the reign demonstrated them.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

6 ‘Thoroughly undeserving of the title “Enlightened Despot”.’ Discuss this view of Joseph II.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: both co ruler and ‘own’ period should be looked at; the work of Kaunitz; he carried on Maria Theresa’s measures; he was quite radical, wanting a unified secular state, for example; he was an egalitarian who wanted to rationalise and centralise; he was a ruthless opportunist in foreign policy; his attacks on traditions and privilege; his sensible aims of self-sufficiency, unity and a competent government; his belief in dignity of the individual; his humane and sound welfare ideas; his tolerance; his views on Poland and Turkey.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A definition, as always, is looked for. Once the criteria are established then it should be possible to develop a good case each way and come to a considered conclusion. It is a well-known and well debated topic, so mature reflection is expected.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

7 ‘Clever and successful.’ Discuss this view of the foreign policy of Catherine the Great.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: she had weak neighbours which made life easier; encouraged expansionism – but was that beneficial necessarily; her Turkish and Polish policies; perhaps took on too much; made Russia too ‘big’; the Treaty of Kutchuk–Kainardji with the Turks; becoming patron of the orthodox in the Balkans; her Black Sea advances and navigating into the Med; the move towards the Crimea and the Black Earth lands.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Both terms need considering and challenging. The ‘perceptive’ aspect needs both definition and reflection, and ‘success’ needs to be considered, not just in terms of acquiring territory. The best will have a definition of both terms in context, with a balanced argument on both aspects.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

8 How important were economic factors in bringing about the crisis in France in 1789?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: a whole range of economic factors need to be considered, both national and local, as well as issues like famine, poverty and the condition of peasantry; also the impact of enlightened ideas; social and class factors; monarchical incompetence; egalitarianism; the various financial crises; ministerial competence / incompetence and the work of Necker and Calonne; the summoning of the Estates General; as well as a range of long-term factors.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The role of economic factors compared to the myriad of other factors needs to be carefully considered. It is hardly a new approach, so balance and depth are looked for with a clear argument as to why economic factors were more/less important than other factors.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

9 ‘Of enormous benefit to France.’ Discuss this verdict on Napoleon’s domestic policies.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the ‘heir to the revolution’ ideas; the termination of the revolutionary phase and restoration of internal stability; the return to autocracy; his propaganda and censorship; the implications of the Berlin Decrees on the economy; his Civil Code, the Concordat and education changes; his egalitarian ideas and ‘careers open to talent’; his version of law and order; industry subordinated to war.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is a lot to debate here and while some might argue that he did bring some benefits to France, it could also be argued that they were hardly enormous and perhaps short term. Sometimes the standard texts appear to be scratching around trying to find something kind to say about Napoleon on the domestic front.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

10 'Unwise experiments followed by savage reaction.' Discuss this view of the domestic policies of Alexander I.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: he had some sympathy with French Revolutionary ideas (early ones), and also for Poland; the 'Reform by assassination' approach; he re-opened the breach between Crown and nobility; the return initially to the better days of Catherine; he was unstable and double-faced: he had lots of ideas but simply never carried them out, for example. On the constitution and rights: his educational ideas never happened; there was no reform of serfdom; he became an aggressively evangelical conservative; the role of Arakcheev; his later treatment of Poland and the military colonies.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The 'wisdom' and the 'savage' aspects might be challenged, as might also the extent to which they were experiments. Current consensus is that he had some not very good ideas, toyed with them, and then lapsed back into classical 'tsarism'.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

Section 3: Themes c.1715–c.1815

- 11 'The role of women in the cultural life of the eighteenth century was of greater importance than their role in intellectual and political life.' How far do you agree?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Women contributed to cultural and intellectual life directly and indirectly as patrons and also creative artists. In the political sphere there were women rulers and women could be indirectly influential. There were some influential political thinkers and the French Revolution gave rise to some important figures such as Madame Roland and some dynamic revolutionaries.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Some may argue that women artists, in the broadest sense, were more directly influential in the cultural sphere, for example, as painters (Angelica Kaufmann, for instance) or as writers. They could also like Madame de Chatelet be patrons or hostesses. Here they supported intellectuals – Madame de Pompadour supported the Philosophes. Political influence could be argued to depend more on circumstances – the accession of women rulers like Catherine the Great or Maria Theresa and the revolutionary activity at the end of the century. There is a view that could be argued that for all this, the influence of key women in politics outweighed the somewhat limited achievements in the arts and the intellectual life of the period, but value judgements are difficult and better answers will offer exemplifications to support judgements.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

12 ‘Profound and deeply influential.’ How valid is this judgement on eighteenth-century political thought?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Many will focus on the enlightenment and the ideas of Rousseau and contract theory’s influence on the French Revolution. Lockean ideas and their impact on America could be considered. The more radical ideas thrown up towards the end of the century, for example, on the rights of man might be considered as well as conservative and monarchist defences. Many enlightenment works had political implications.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘Profound’ invites some estimation of the thought itself, but if the balance is more towards discussing how ‘influential’ key theorists were, then this sort of analysis could go to highest marks. Some may argue that challenges to the established order were massively influential; others may argue that compared to more ‘concrete’ elements, the political theories of the period were interesting and contributed to a general atmosphere of questioning authority but were not hugely influential on events and developments. No set answer is expected here in terms of approaches or in terms of the theorists selected.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

13 How far did formal rules and conventions inhibit true creativity in eighteenth-century music?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The range is from the late Baroque of Bach and Handel and their contemporaries through the ‘gallant’ style to the Viennese classical music of Haydn and Mozart and early Beethoven. There might be a distinction between vocal and instrumental music. Formal organisational conventions became less significant in operas – the great works of Mozart are not dictated to by formal da capo or sonata form style.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. From a nineteenth-century viewpoint, the formalities precluded the sort of tone painting or free flow that characterised later music. The great composers of the eighteenth century, however, went far beyond the formal rules that dominated the music of their lesser contemporaries. Haydn brought a flood of invention to his 104 symphonies and was always prepared to introduce novelties. It would be absurd to see Bach’s mastery of form as being incompatible with elements of fantasy and, above all, expression. Mozart, especially in the da Ponte operas took formal contrivances to a new level of creativity. However, minor masters like Sammartini, Krauss and Canabich were less successful. Connoisseurs may point to interesting variations of form, but only a handful of geniuses transcended both operatic and instrumental convention. Whether freeflow romanticism or eclectic modernism produced anything better than the St Matthew Passion, Handel’s Giulio Cesare or Mozart’s Prague Symphony, though, may be doubted.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 15	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

14 Discuss the view that colonies in the eighteenth century brought few benefits to their European owners.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the benefits of trade and settlement; the influx of raw materials; the opening up of new markets; the development of great centres like Amsterdam and Nantes; but there the costs of wars and maintenance gave an inappropriate focus to foreign policy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some consideration of what might or might not be ‘benefits’ needs to be there. There is a straightforward case to be made each way. What contemporaries may have seen as a benefit might not appear the same to posterity, with the ‘millstones around our necks’ view.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 16	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

15 Assess the nature and extent of industrial development in eighteenth-century Europe.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: arguably pre-industrial to c.1750; self-sufficiency still the aim; economies still dominated by, for example, the handloom weavers of Catalonia or Abbeville; the lack of specialisation; what changes tended to be embryonic; often subordinated to needs of state/war; there was some growth of awareness by government, and changes in banking and investment.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Nature and extent: both need to be considered separately. While there are not the massive changes evident in the UK, there are signs of growth, and awareness of potential and possible benefits and resources.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 17	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

16 What best explains changes in styles of monarchy in Europe during this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the re-examination of both role and responsibility of the monarch; the arrival of more contractual ideas; a growing awareness of the failings of ancien régimes; the spread of the ideas of Locke; the ideas of Montesquieu, Voltaire and Rousseau; the impact of the American revolution; the bombshell of the French revolution.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Reflection on both roles and responsibilities should be there and consideration of whether changes in attitude were superficial or profound.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 18	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

Section 4: 1815–1862

17 How realistic were the solutions of the Vienna Settlement to the issues faced by the peacemakers?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Among the issues faced by the peacemakers were the legacies of the territorial changes brought by the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. The prevention of further aggression by France; the need to re-make Italy and Germany; the response to the rise of nationalism and liberalism; the desire for some recompense by Britain for the huge sums spent defeating France; the need to establish international peace and internal stability based on monarchy

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. The treatment of France and the rehabilitation of the French monarchy into the European diplomatic system might be seen as realistic. In some cases, rewarding key victor powers like Britain, Russia, Prussia and Austria might be seen as realistic. Creating an ongoing series of meetings to deal with issues might be seen as realistic. There might be more dispute about trying to restore the ante-bellum Europe – with the growth of nationalism and liberalism engendered by the revolution and Napoleon’s new Europe. Some might see the long period of relative peace after 1814–15 as evidence of underlying realism; other might see the protracted struggles of nationalism to overturn the system as evidence of ideological short-sightedness and see the Congress System failing fairly quickly.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 19	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

18 To what extent, if at all, did the reign of Nicholas I benefit Russia?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The reign began in 1825 with attempted revolt and the Tsar maintained a repressive regime to avoid another based on ‘orthodoxy, autocracy and nationality’. The reign is known for its censorship and repression of intellectuals and liberalism. The rights of nationalities were suppressed and the Russian language and the Orthodox Church promoted at the expense of other languages and religions. The Tsar was close to the repressive policies of Austria. Revolution in Poland was suppressed in 1831 and Poland heavily controlled. The Tsar aided the cause of reaction in 1848. Traditional ambitions were followed in policy towards the Ottoman Empire which resulted in European reaction against Russia in the Straits Settlement of 1841 and in the Crimean War which revealed the failure of the Tsar to modernise. Railways were begun and some industry promoted and the Tsar ameliorated the lot of the serfs on royal estates, but little was done in the way of social and economic reform.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. There might be a case for questioning whether the policies offered any substantial benefit. There were some attempts to reform serf conditions, some interest in education, as in the foundation of Kiev University, some railway development and Russia did not face revolution and upheaval in 1848. There was, despite the repression, some cultural development and Russia’s interests were pursued in the Eastern Question. The Orthodox Church and the Russian nobility were supported and the supporters of Russification were satisfied. Against this, the non-Russian elements and progressives faced persecution and Russia did not keep up with economic developments in the west.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 20	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

19 ‘Charles X deserved to fall; Louis Philippe did not.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The failure of Charles X in 1830 came after attempts to restore the ancient regime such as the anti-sacrilege laws, attempts to compensate the nobility for loss of land and even primogeniture. The coronation seemed to show the desire for an older monarchy. The disbanding of the National Guard in 1827 and the refusal to respond to the Chamber’s demands for responsible government in 1830 followed by the Ordinances of St Cloud. Louis Philippe showed more awareness of bourgeois needs but with a restricted franchise and a regime which favoured some sections of the bourgeoisie more than others, discontent had begun to build. There was no attempt to widen the franchise and limited reforms to improve working conditions. The outlawing of the political reform banquets together with economic downturn and bad harvests united middle and working class discontents in February 1848. When troops fired on crowds, Paris became uncontrollable and the King lost the support of his chief minister, Guizot.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. The obvious line is that Charles was indeed more personally responsible by narrow policies which looked backward and ignored the changes of the Revolution and threatened the constitutional monarchy. Louis Philippe was more cautious, but the victim of changing circumstances – economic growth meant that the results of downturn from 1846 led to mass discontent. However, there is another view that neither was able to adapt to the needs of the time and that both were the victims of a revolutionary inheritance that made France ungovernable. No set answer is expected.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 21	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

20 Why was a united Germany not achieved before 1871?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. After the end of Napoleonic Germany there was a reversion to a less united central Europe under Austrian domination. The repression of Metternich and the limited strength of nationalism may explain why Germany remained divided. The revolutions of 1848 revealed that a liberal Germany could not withstand internal divisions and the military force of the monarchs. Austrian domination was reinforced by the end of the Erfurt Union. Only with the industrial growth of Prussia, the changes brought about by the Crimean war and Italian unification did the context change sufficient for Bismarck to overcome Austrian control. Even then, greater unification had to wait for a successful war against France.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. The factors may be the influence of foreign powers with an interest in keeping the centre of Europe divided; the relative weakness of the nationalist movement; the divisions between the classes and between different views of unification. Better answers may attempt to assess factors.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 22	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

21 'The main reason for the unification of Italy by 1861 was the success of Cavour's diplomacy.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The ability of Cavour to gain international sympathy for the cause of unification, his participation in the Crimean War and his raising of the Italian question at Paris; his negotiations with Napoleon III and the pact to gain vital French support and the avoidance of international intervention in the events following Garibaldi's invasion of Sicily and Naples will be considered. To assess whether the diplomacy was the main reason should involve a consideration of other possible reasons, but these should be related to the factor in the question.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Against the purely diplomatic work of Cavour could be set the economic development of Piedmont; the growth of Italian national feeling; the work of Garibaldi and the weakness of the resistance in Sicily and Naples; the rapid response of Cavour and the King to the invasion and the opportunities afforded by the relative weakness of Austria and changes to international politics brought about by the Crimean War.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 23	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

Section 5: 1862–1914

22 To what extent did the foreign policy of Bismarck in the period 1871 to 1890 achieve its aims?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Aims need to be established and these will probably be seen as the isolation of France and the prevention of encirclement together with avoiding a choice between Russia and Austria. Aims are usually seen as essentially defensive and may include the use of foreign policy to secure his domestic position. The settlement with France, the Dreikaiserbund, the alliance with Austria, the Reinsurance Treaty and the Congress of Berlin are the main elements, but the colonial expansion may also be considered.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Many will see the aims being achieved for most of the period in office and many will accept the view that the clever manipulation prevented Germany being faced with the alliance between France and Russia and the hostility of Britain that was supposedly the fault of the diplomacy of his successors. Others may be more critical of incidents such as the War Scare which had the opposite effect of what was intended and may see the Congress of Berlin not having the desired aim and of increasingly stressful relations with Russia already showing before Bismarck's fall, the contradictions of the policy and its inherent instability. Good answers relate analysis firmly to a consideration of aims and will not be a general survey pointing out good and bad points.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 24	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

23 How stable was Wilhelmine Germany?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Stability might be seen in terms of politics, of economic growth, of social cohesion or in terms of a foreign policy which did not threaten European peace and order. Answers which did not deal with all factors evenly could go to highest marks for a good discussion of the key element of stability and went beyond the Kaiser personally.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Many will see instability – rapidly growing industry and trade brought about problems of balance in the economy between big business, cartels and traditional farming, smaller crafts and shops. The crisis of the Mittelstand was evident by the early twentieth century. The rise of large industrial concerns was mirrored by the growth of trade unions, catching the independent farmers and lower middle class between them. The booming cities brought overcrowding and discontent and the rise of socialism – the SPD was the largest party by 1912 – and the threat of revolution. It could be argued that the constitution brought instability and that the Kaiser’s unpredictability ensured that there were political crises like the Daily Telegraph incident.

Excessive militarism could be seen as a source of instability – the navy bringing about rivalry with Britain; the growing power and influence of the army threatening the rule of law. Extreme nationalism together with erratic foreign policies could be seen to weaken stability. On the other hand, it may be that Wilhelmine Germany is seen too much through the prism of the war and collapse – Germany was admired for its industrial, scientific and cultural progress. There was a functioning constitution for all its faults and the federal system worked. The naval race was resolved; international talks did resolve the Balkan issues; the fact that voters could express their support for an SPD which was not wildly revolutionary in practice did mean there was an outlet for discontent. The war produced a remarkable degree of national unity. Good answers need not offer a complete balance, but reward attempts to assess rather than merely explain.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 25	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

24 Who ruled Russia more effectively in the period 1881–1914: Alexander III or Nicholas II?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Alexander III pursued a vigorous policy of Russification, repression of revolutionary ideas and regional separatism; he reduced the powers of the Zemstva and increased the control of the Ministry of the Interior. Education was controlled and censorship strengthened. However, the economy grew. Nicholas II lacked the vigour to sustain purely reactionary policies and poor judgement over the war with Japan led to revolution and attempts to reform. Repression continued but there were major reforms to agriculture under Stolypin, a national Duma and changes to education and the armed forces.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Some may argue that Alexander III was more effective in the short term because he was more consistent but laid up problems for his successor. Some may argue that the concessions after 1905 were more effective than the brutal repression of Alexander but were undermined by war. Some may argue that neither engaged fully with the need for political change to meet the changes in economy and society. No set answer is required but judgements should be supported and comparison should be sustained.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 26	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

25 Was Italy more divided in 1871 or in 1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The divisions of 1871 may be seen in the gap between North and South and the resentment of enforced Piedmontisation of the different regions after 1861. The divisions between the hastily erected liberal state and the Pope resulted in the alienation of many from the new kingdom. By 1871 there were considerable divisions in language, tradition and culture between the regions and there were still parts of Italy – notably Venetia – that remained outside the new kingdom.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Judgements should be offered about the extent to which the liberal state had managed to overcome these divisions by 1914. The economic gap between North and South still existed and the extensive emigration had been predominantly from the South. The latifundiae and the criminal organisations still existed. The South was still in 1914 seen as a remote and alien area. However, Italy had had 40 years of experience of unity – the rift with the Catholics had been healed to some extent; there had been attempts to instil a new nationalism by colonial policy; there was some progress towards extending the electorate and towards a political system which accommodated different interests; there had been more education, between communications and more literacy. However, alongside this were more acute divisions between labour and capital than had existed in 1871 before the considerable industrial expansion made by Italy from the 1880s. The growth of extreme nationalism and socialism made Italy divided in a different way.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 27	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

26 'No one country, but rather irresponsible militarism throughout Europe, should be blamed for the First World War.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The key element in the irresponsible militarism – the naval race; the reliance on ever-increasing armies and extended military service; the existence of contingency plans which disregarded possible casualty rates or, as with the Schlieffen Plan, international law. The other element is not one country – the reliance on alliances and agreements and the overall spread of nationalism. The willingness of more than one country to use war to fulfil long-term aims.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. The challenge to the question might be to question whether it was purely military build-up that was to blame or whether colonial rivalry, or longer-term ambitions in the Balkans and the French desire for revenge – or whether Germany was to blame for encouraging instability and backing Austria. It is unlikely that a description of the events leading to war would address this question adequately.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 28	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

Section 6: Themes c.1815–1914

27 Why was the Eastern Question so difficult to resolve in the period 1815–1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates might refer to Greek Independence, the impact of Mehmet Ali and the Straits Convention, the Crimean War, the Eastern Crisis 1875–78, the influence of Germany in the Balkans, the issue of Bulgaria, the Balkan Wars and the outbreak of war in 1914, but the question would be better approached in terms of themes and issues than by attempting a series of descriptions or explanations.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates might refer to the fears that Russia would take advantage of Turkish weaknesses; the growth of Balkan nationalism; the interference of France; the fears of Britain for her route to India; the concerns of Austria; the emergence of Germany as a player in the Eastern Question. The protracted decline of the Ottoman Empire and the links between the Eastern Question and other European issues; the ongoing conflicting interests of the great powers could be analysed. It is not expected that there will be equal treatment of all the elements but there should be a sense that the period as a whole has been looked at; better answers may see how the issues remained the same and how new issues came in to make the problem ongoing and difficult to solve.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 29	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

28 What best explains why the European powers had so much interest in the acquisition of territory outside Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The expansion of formal control over areas of economic interest and the rush to acquire new overseas territories such as ‘the Scramble for Africa’ can be explained in economic terms, such as the Great Depression of the 1870s leading to greater protectionism and the desire of European states to secure raw materials and resources; Imperialism has been seen as the last phase of capitalism and a desire for investment opportunity; population increase and a need for outlets for surplus people. There have been explanations based on the internal pressures from domestic politics such as the need for Italy to show herself as a great power and the pressure from Imperialist groups on Imperial Germany. There were initiatives taken by ‘men on the spot’ and also the desire to prevent rivals from colonising. Mass politics and communication opened the way for enthusiasts of colonising missions to spread their ideas, and there were religious and philanthropic pressures to spread ‘civilisation’.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. There may not be an overarching theory – the purely business motives for the exploitation of the Congo, for instance, do not sit easily alongside theories of strategic importance or moral imperatives, or the desire for emergent nations to have their ‘place in the sun’. However better answers will attempt to address ‘best explains’ rather than offering a list of reasons or colonial examples

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 30	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

29 To what extent can changes in any one of the arts in this period be explained by changes in society?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. There were many artistic changes in the period – the influence of the Romantic Movement, Nationalism in the arts, the decline of formalism; the emergence of new schools of painting like Impressionism. Social changes which relate to artistic developments might include the growth of a middle class, the expansion of cities and therefore interest in and market for arts; the growth of wider patronage and public concerts and exhibition rooms, and the development of popular culture and appetite for the arts in the later part of the period. Social change could encompass greater education and literacy and a wider audience for novels, for instance.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. The debate is whether artistic change can be wholly explained by social change or has its roots in the arts alone – the desire of artists to experiment and develop quite independently of the society in which they live; or in technological changes – for example, larger pianos, or steel framed buildings and bridges, or cheaper and more available printing, or better-equipped theatres.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 31	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

30 Which had the greater impact on the people of Europe in this period: industrial growth or the development of transport?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The question does say ‘the people’ and industrial growth should be seen in terms of the impact of different work disciplines, the decline of domestic outwork, the experience of factory and larger workshop production, the exposure to the ups and downs of demand, the access to new ideas, e.g. socialism; the movement from the countryside; the greater opportunities of industrial work as well as its hazards and hardships; the more varied consumer products. In terms of transport the development of a national market; the greater spread of ideas; the decline of localism; the employment opportunities from canal, road and rail building; the speed of communication; the economic growth that railways brought; the increase in law and order and the power of the state; the investment opportunities; the hazards and dangers of railway accidents. Mass tourism, migration on a large scale overseas etc.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. The two are linked and candidates who make that point and argue that it is not possible to see them as independent developments should not be penalised. Some may argue that it was industrialisation that made the greatest transformation as the whole nature of work was changed and industrial economics had different values, different political agendas and different social structures. Others may see transport as more important as the nature of countries changed – with unified markets, culture, language as regionalism was ended and international travel and trade ‘made the world smaller’ and had profound economic effects in terms of global markets with global price movements.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 32	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

31 Assess the impact of Marx’s political and economic ideas in later nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century Europe.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Marx’s ideas offered a scientific basis for revolutionary change and gave their supporters a sense of historical purpose and the inevitability of change. By offering supported ‘scientific’ analysis of the contradictions of capitalism and a vision of a new society, Marx offered a sense of hope to radical groups and the growth of a mass socialist party in Germany where industrial growth seemed to be creating the proletariat which was destined to establish a dictatorship and subsequently a Communist state is evidence of the impact. In less developed countries like Russia the ideas had an impact way beyond the limited number of adherents as the ideology proved flexible to ingenious thinkers like Lenin. In France and Spain where there were different revolutionary traditions there was impact but less so than in Germany.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Some may see the ideas as having relatively limited impact – their stress on the industrial working class as the vanguard of change limited the impact in predominantly rural countries. In Russia the SRs were considerably stronger. Also the ideas were the subject of considerable debate within the social democrats – as the split in Russia between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks showed. In Italy socialism grew with the industrialisation in the North, but not in the more agrarian South. Anarchism offered competing revolutionary motivation in Spain.

Trade unionism did not sit easily with ideas of a doomed capitalist system, scientifically proven to be so riddled with contradictions and inequality that it was bound to fail. Improvements brought by organised labour would merely delay the process. The largest socialist party did not appear to be a revolutionary party, so Marx’s ideas were accepted in the form of theoretical analysis and not really an incentive to action, which was seen almost to be redundant given the likelihood of imminent collapse of the capitalist system. However, an alternative would be to see their potential for bringing about change – the fact that they could be adapted to local conditions by reinterpreting some terms and that they gave confidence and purpose to revolutionaries like Lenin. The growth of socialist parties was an important development in Europe and challenged existing elites. No set answer is expected here but impact rather than just the nature of the ideas must be the focus.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 33	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

32 Why did the status of women change more in some countries than others in Europe in the period c.1850–c.1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Answers do need to focus on the areas of changing status and in what areas – education, greater employment opportunity, more acceptance of political participation, more cultural participation, changes in legal status – are being discussed. In some countries women were able to organise and demand change more easily than others.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Given that women’s organisations were mostly middle class for example, the German Women’s League of 1865, one factor might be how far different nations had developed a large and articulate middle class and how great the pace of urbanisation was. Another contributing factor was political radicalism – socialist ideas often supported change for women. Where political change was repressed it was difficult for women to achieve changes in status. Another factor might be educational opportunities, a key to self-awareness, and demand for change and the acceptance of women on more equal status. Where there was literacy and good communication it became easier for ideas of ‘feminism’ to take hold.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 34	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

Section 7: 1914–1945

33 Given the heavy loss of life, why was there not more opposition in the combatant states to the First World War?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The limited representation of the socialist groups at the Zimmerwald conference of 1915 indicated that even on the left there was not widespread pacifism. The political groups had generally swung behind the war as had the churches. Wartime regulations made opposition difficult and as losses mounted it seemed to undermine the sacrifices made by others to support an end to the war. The mass national enthusiasms of the pre-war period carried on into the war and even as casualties mounted, anti-war stances were not popular and often dangerous. Lenin’s peace policy was not universally popular and the unfavourable peace resulted in civil war.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Much of the answer may lie in the organisation of the European states for war and the considerable expansion of government power and restrictions on freedom. However, mass communications and propaganda together with a shared sense of sacrifice and mission contributed to the difficulties of protest. The feeling that the war was winnable was a big factor with ideas of ‘big pushes’. The development of the idea of the links between the Home Front and the fighting and the belief in causes which were characteristic of ‘total war’ made mass support for opposition less likely, as did the repression of opposition and control of media.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 35	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

34 'The principal failing of the Paris Peace settlements after the First World War was that they were excessively idealistic.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Idealistic elements might be seen as national self-determination and the belief that new states would be viable and democratic, even with the existence of minorities and the lack of parliamentary traditions. The League of Nations as a support for peace might be seen as over-idealistic. It might be that hopes for disarmament and hopes that nations who had lost land or had failed to gain the lands they wanted would accept the peace for the general good were idealistic. The idea of Mandated territories rested on an idealistic view of how the colonial powers would administer them.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. The counter view is that the Treaty undermined the idealism that Wilson wanted to be brought to the peace process by insisting on reparations; that colonial additions were made with little regard for the real interests of the inhabitants; that the powers wanted to use national aspirations to create a cordon sanitaire against the USSR for their own interests; that Germany was punished to please the electorates in France and Britain; that national interests, such as that of British naval power and French border security were placed before attempts to establish long-term peace. Better answers will attempt a balance between those ideas which did look beyond national interests and come to a considered judgement.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 36	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

35 How far do economic factors explain the fall of the Weimar Republic?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Economic problems dogged the earlier years of Weimar culminating in the collapse of the currency. Its strongest years were apparently when there was some economic recovery, 1925–29 and its collapse coincided with the effects of the Wall Street Collapse. In sectors with ongoing economic problems, for example rural areas, Nazi strength was more evident. The rise of Communism and Nazism representation in the Reichstag increased with the rise in unemployment.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. The alternative explanations lie in the political extremism at the birth of Weimar and the shock of defeat; the lack of a democratic tradition and the skill with which its enemies exploited economic disasters. The inherent weaknesses of the Republic were apparent in the decline in the meetings of the Reichstag and the way that unrepresentative elements intrigued around an aged president. These elements could be argued to have less to do with economic crisis than with the nature of German society and political life. The political skills demonstrated by Hitler in exploiting both economic circumstances and the inherent weaknesses of the Republic do have to be assessed. Better answers will address ‘how far’ and not just offer economic factors and other elements in a series of explanations.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 37	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

36 Did Stalin better serve the interests of Russia before or after 1941?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. If Stalin could be said to have served Russia's interests and not his own power or ideological convictions, it is in the transformation and modernisation of the economy in the 1930s; the development of better communications and greater urban housing stock and facilities; extensive industrial growth; the ability to produce arms on a large scale and a sense of national purpose. After 1941 the Russian war effort was sustained and despite huge losses considerable amounts of war supplies supported 'the great patriotic war' with a ruthless sense of purpose. Russian restoration of lands lost in 1918 and the extension of Russian control over Eastern Europe made her a major participant in world affairs, which could be said to have served her interests. From Russia's point of view, security was obtained and she was not invaded again.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. It might be questioned whether either period really served Russia's interests: the costs of economic change in human terms was enormous and the results patchy. The purges eradicated vital economic and scientific expertise and military leadership. Stalin failed to foresee and prepare for the German invasion of 1941. Had a more realistic policy been followed then the initial German invasion might not have been so successful and the subsequent losses to repel the invaders might not have been so high. The war was conducted in a way wasteful of life and resources and the post-war settlement involved Russia in a protracted and costly arms race. Security might be seen as a justification for control of Eastern Europe which, in the end, proved unsustainable and of limited benefit. If candidates argue that the two cannot be separated – that war success was dependent on the actions of the 1930s and that the Russia of 1928 would have quickly been defeated by German invasion, then this is an acceptable argument. Most may argue that Stalin came into his own as war leader. Look for judgement and supported comparison.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 38	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

37 'It is a gross simplification to see the conflict which developed from 1939 to 1945 as "Hitler's War".' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Hitler aimed to revise the Treaty of Versailles, but the occupation of Bohemia and Moravia went further than merely returning ceded territory and his ideas of geopolitical conquest threatened the stability of Europe. The German invasion of Poland had little justification and was the cause of the outbreak of war. The idea that it is a simplification to see this as the main narrative would be based on the instabilities created by the threat of Versailles, which were the basis of conflict; the weaknesses of France and Britain in the face of obvious German expansion; the failure of the western democracies to act with Russia and the pact that Russia made with Hitler in 1939, which made the invasion of Poland a possibility; the destabilising effects of Italian expansion and support for Hitler and the role of Japan in distracting the West and offering a problem for Britain which led service chiefs to advocate appeasement.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. It could be said that Hitler articulated but did not create grievances; that Hitler exploited situations created by others; that Hitler's desires to expand were only one aspect of Axis expansionism; that foolish decisions by others offered opportunities that any German statesman might have exploited. However, though his predecessors weakened Versailles, they did not rearm to the extent that he did nor did they incite ideological hatred and openly propose massive geopolitical change. There was huge support for the foreign policy successes, but less so among the army people and even party for the actual war that broke out in September 1939. Thereafter, the successes did mean that the war became more than just Hitler's War and after 1942–3 the Fuhrer and the people were locked together in a battle for survival.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 39	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

Section B: 1945–2000

38 How serious were the challenges to Soviet domination in the satellite states of Eastern Europe in the period from 1953 to 1985?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Most answers will focus on resistance in East Berlin in 1953, in Poland and especially Hungary in 1956, in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and in the emergence of further opposition in Poland with the growth of Solidarity.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. The issue is not why the resistance failed but its extent and the seriousness of the threat it posed. There should be some distinction between the scale of the challenges and the level of response they drew from the USSR and the reaction of the West. It might be argued that the Hungarian Revolt was the most serious in terms of the severity of the fighting and the condemnation that it brought. However, the over-reaction to the Czech crisis might have undermined the Soviet state more, and Solidarity after 1980 attracted over 9 million supporters, resisted attempts to control it and forced negotiations which led to elections in 1989. This might be linked with the eventual fall of the USSR, even if the question does only go to 1985. Much will depend on how ‘serious challenge’ is interpreted.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 40	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

39 Assess the importance of Adenauer to securing political stability in West Germany.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Adenauer helped to found the CSU in 1946 which took office in 1949. Conservative yet anti-authoritarian, Adenauer embraced the West. The anti-leftist feeling which had bolstered the Hitler regime was now given a party to embrace which favoured freedom and democracy. The price was to take in those who had supported the Nazis and to offer an amnesty, but this ensured stability in that Nazism, which had been genuinely popular and supported by millions, did not reappear. His support for NATO led to western support, economic aid and prosperity which bolstered the stability of West Germany. His policies of integration linked Federal Germany with European defence policies and also the nascent EC. Having the capital at Bonn was a fresh start and a move from Prussian Berlin. Nazism was characterised as the work of a criminal clique which allowed for previous supporters to be integrated in the new democracy. Franco-German economic cooperation reoriented Germany and the Holstein doctrine made it clear that it would be a separate entity. Nazification ended in 1951, but Adenauer acknowledged Germany's obligation to compensate Jewish victims, striking a balance between regretting and drawing a line under the past. The return of PoWs from Russia and the integration of the Saarland were popular policies which seemed to aid the return to normal.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Against Adenauer's sole contribution must be set the considerable US aid to Germany and also the 'economic miracle' which underpinned Adenauer but was not specifically his work, but the policy of Erhard, in the context of a more prosperous Western Europe and USA. Having the East and the USSR as an external enemy whose policies were clearly offering less prosperity and against whom the West Germans needed to unite with the support of NATO was outside Adenauer's control, though he made use of it. It might be argued that the later period of office saw less stability. However, compared with Weimar, West Germany did achieve a sustained democracy, prosperity and it did come to terms with the past.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 41	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

40 'The USA was responsible both for beginning and ending the Cold War.' Discuss this view.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. This view would be supported by Truman's hostility to Stalin, his use of the Atomic Bomb advantage to be antagonistic at Potsdam; the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan; the US creating a currency union and bringing about the Berlin crisis, NATO. The wartime disagreements and the delay of the Second Front might be relevant. Ending the Cold War would include the pressure brought to bear on the USSR by military development and helping to support the war in Afghanistan, though on-going US hostility might be taken back further.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. The discussion might be about whether it was the attitude of Stalin that did more to bring about the Cold War – the Katyn massacres, the failure to help the Warsaw rising, the establishment of the satellite states; the dispute over Iran; the Berlin Blockade, Comintern and Cominform; also the decision to invade Afghanistan, the overreach of arms; the continuing repression of the Soviet blocs and confrontations with the West going back to the Berlin Wall and the Cuban Crisis. Candidates might offer a synthesis in which both beginning and end are a combination of factors and mutual misunderstandings and failures to compromise.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 42	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

41 Assess the importance for France in the years 1945–62 of developments in Algeria.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The Algerian War, 1954–62, brought down the French Fourth Republic and deeply divided France, injuring its international reputation. The question concerns the outbreak of the insurrection against French rule in 1954, the prolonged struggle between the FLN and the French forces; the return of de Gaulle to forestall a coup in 1958, the end of the Fourth Republic, the attempts at a settlement, the rise of the OAS, the pieds noirs attempt at insurrection in 1961 and the end of the war in 1962. The question goes back to 1945 to put the war in the context of France’s attempt to rebuild her reputation after the German occupation and the loss of Indo China.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Algeria was the longest-established of the North African possessions of France and seen as part of the country. After the defeats of 1940 and the defeat in Indo China in 1954, the French army was determined not to be defeated again. Resorts to brutal torture and repression in an ‘asymmetric war’ not against conventional forces but against opposition embedded within the civilian population brought deep divisions within France, with the French Communist Party deeply opposed. Resentments within the army brought the threat of an overthrow of the Republic, averted by the appointment of de Gaulle. The war brought de Gaulle back to power for the first time since 1946. However, he disappointed the hopes of the right and the conflict became more bitter with the rise of the OAS and intense pieds noirs opposition to compromise. France’s NATO allies were concerned about the violence and France suffered a decline in international reputation. De Gaulle survived conspiracies against him and France had to acknowledge the end of her colonial past in 1962 and took in large numbers of French colonists. Some distinction might be drawn between the political importance in terms of the change from the Fourth to the Fifth Republic and the motional significance as France tried, without success, to overcome the traumas of previous defeats.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 43	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

42 How far did Franco achieve his aims as ruler of Spain in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Franco’s aims are usually seen as traditionalist rather than fascist and many were negative – the repression of political and regional opposition; the promotion of traditional cultural and Castilian Spanish; the alignment with the anti-Communist West and the rebuilding of economic life after war and isolation.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Franco’s repression – now known to be remarkably brutal and extensive – did secure the regime. Regional aspirations were suppressed and Castilian language promoted. Traditional moral values and the role of the Church were maintained. Isolation internationally was ended by the establishment of good relations with the USA after 1953. Franco was not able to maintain the colonial empire despite a protracted struggle with Morocco over the Spanish Sahara. By utilising economic experts and dismantling controls Spain was able to enjoy some economic growth after 1959. Helped by foreign investment, cheap labour and the absence of strikes and effective unionism, the economy grew, bolstering the regime. Franco kept a balance between maintaining his personal power and respecting the traditional monarchy by seeing himself as a regent and then designating in 1969 Juan Carlos as his successor. However obnoxious and inimical to social and political progress the regime was, in terms of Franco’s aims, the regime after 1945 might be seen as successful, though underground opposition did continue.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 44	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

Section 9: Themes c.1914–2000

43 Assess the legacy of European imperialism after 1945.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Legacy might be seen in terms of problems – for example, the often artificial regional boundaries imposed by the colonisers; or in terms of the results of divide and rule policies between tribes or regional and religious groups. Sometimes administrative procedures and bureaucracies left a top-heavy legacy as did the limited development of native industry and an economic structure suited to the colonial powers.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Answers may weigh the disadvantages against the positive inheritance – communications development, education, stable administrations. But where the decolonisation process resulted in considerable conflict, there was the legacy of destruction, of colonial repression encouraging political extremism. Much depends on the examples chosen, but better answers may offer a balanced view, perhaps distinguishing between colonies which were relinquished peacefully and those which saw bitter warfare. There is also a distinction possible between very long-established colonies like India or Algeria and colonies which had limited colonial rule and influence.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 45	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

44 To what extent had the European Union benefited the people of its member states by 2000?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Much depends on the definition of benefit – economic benefits resulting from trade and investment; social benefits from the movement of people and the opportunities for wider migration; political benefits from a common parliament and executive dealing with Europe-wide issues, and the end of the European conflicts that dogged the period from 1870–1945.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. There will be negative views that the costs for the people in some countries have been disproportionate to benefits; that migration has not helped some countries and that there have been net losers as well as net gainers; that European bureaucracy has not been uniformly beneficial; that the EC has merely reflected a historical trend away from European conflict, not made that conflict less likely in itself. Look for support for both criticisms and praise of the impact of the EC. The view that encouraging a European outlook rather than a narrow national outlook may well be considered.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 46	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

45 Was European cultural life more dynamic in the inter-war period or in the 1960s and 1970s?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Much depends on a definition of ‘cultural life’ – most will see this as the work of artistic creation, but the participation of people in cultural events and the expansion of cultural media – TV, international concerts broadcast to mass audiences, large venues for cultural events – may also be considered. ‘Dynamic’ also needs to be considered – not just quantity but forward-moving, innovative, challenging and embracing more people.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Supporters of the inter-war period might argue from a break away from bourgeois norms and Romantic self-indulgence – Stravinsky, Bauhaus, the greater acceptance of modernist pre-war experiments. Others may see this as still rooted in elite culture and still merely a reaction to and modification of traditional styles, whereas the 1960s and 70s offered more genuine modernism, experiment and creativity as well as the development of a wider view of culture. No set answer is expected, but a comparative judgement should be supported and there should be strong exemplification in better answers.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 47	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

46 How well did European states deal with demographic change in the period after c.1945?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Demographic change would include the recovery of the European populations after the losses of the war; the changing balance between urban and rural population and the effects of immigration on the demography of individual countries. By the end of the period it might include the changing balance in age profiles within populations.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. The policies of European states both in Western and Eastern Europe to deal with population growth, with a younger population and with movements of population might be considered. The provision of employment and welfare might be relevant and the way that changes in the make-up of populations have been dealt with and how European countries have approached the needs of a greater proportion of older people brought about by health improvement and longer lives.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 48	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

47 To what extent, if at all, did the feminist movement enhance the status of women in Europe in the later twentieth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. The wider aims of the feminist movement of the 1960s should be considered with the widespread use of ‘Women’s Liberation’ to indicate liberation from cultural and social stereotyping and restriction in the wake of a feeling that political equality and educational opportunities had not ended sexual inequality, particularly in western consumerist society.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Distinction might be made between Western and Eastern Europe, and status might be assessed by greater economic opportunity, changes in the cultural attitudes to women, more concern with sexist vocabulary in the media. There are problems in assessing enhancement of status and some may feel that, despite the passionate demands, there has been a lack of progress. There has been increased equality in employment but not equal status in top positions; despite some high-profile women leaders, political life has not been equally shared; problems with child care provision persist and male attitudes have been slow to change.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 49	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	23

48 Who gained and who lost from the revolution in communications in post-war Europe?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Communications could include the expansion of motorways and road travel, high speed trains, more and cheaper air travel, the expansion of TV, mobile phones and email and IT communication.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. Winners might be elements of business, the general public in richer countries enjoying more and cheaper travel, consumers of mass entertainment, schools and learners, the state, terrorist groups, sporting organisers and consumers. Losers might be those who suffer from pollution, traffic chaos, workers who have lost their jobs to globalisation and e-shopping, cultures degraded by mass tourism, regions that have been forced into uniformity with more contact with the wider world, learners bombarded with information they find more difficult to process and assess.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.