

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 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 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

Section 1: c. 1715-c. 1774

1 What best explains the changing fortunes of the Ottoman Empire in the period 1718–1774?

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 takes the period between the treaty of Passarowitz in 1718 and the Treaty of Kuchuk Kainarji in 1774. Between the losses incurred in these agreements, there was a period of westernisation and change – the Tulip Age under Ahmad III 1718–1730 and some military successes under Mahmud II (1730–1754), but in general the period is seen as one of decline and failure to keep up with the developments in Western Europe.

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.

The varying abilities of the Sultans and their advisers may well explain the variable fortunes of the Empire, but longer-term factors might include the loss of revenue, land and outlet for the armed forces with the end of expansion from the late seventeenth century. Westernisation did lead to some military development, but the state did not change in the way that the Western European states had developed and the administrative and economic underpinning necessary to remain a great power and resist the West was not there. The inability to control the Janissaries and the people of Constantinople was a crucial reason for the end of the reform period in 1730. This was of major importance in leading to 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, punctuation and grammar.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

**2 ‘France was better governed during Louis XV’s minority than during his majority.’
Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

A very wide range of factors could be considered’ such as: the retention of the traditional departmental rivalries; the absence of a ‘premier minister’; the centralised bureaucracy remained; the Council and its rituals remained; total responsibility remained with the Crown, but not total power; the clergy, the nobility and Parlement could still be obstructive. In the minority, with Orleans : he had complete control; prevented chaos; his use of Parlement and the implications of this; his failings in conciliar use; made a real attempt to sort out finance; his peaceful foreign policy; the Law disaster; some stimulus to trade and industry. Under Fleury, the period of repose came to an end; both Chancellor d’Aguesseau and Orry the Controller General were very competent. During the majority however: foreign policy could easily be criticised; his indecisiveness and laziness; factionalism at court; serious ministerial instability; the management (or otherwise) of Jansenism, Parlement, money and foreign policy; the usual excesses of the Ancien Regime; the lack of economic progress.

AO2 – is 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 and 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 evidence does point to agreeing with the quote, although it could be argued that the main focus of the minority was propping up a regime and keeping it going until the successor of Louis XIV could continue in much the same way as his predecessor. Reflection on what might or might not constitute ‘good government’ is looked for and those who really think about what would be ‘good government’ for France in the eighteenth century should do well.

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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

3 'More despotic than enlightened.' Assess this view of Maria Theresa.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

A wide range of factors could be covered in the answer, ranging from: her overall domestic policies; the degree of centralisation brought into her domains; the groundwork laid for the later work of Joseph II; her dealings with nobles and noble tax exemption; serfdom and her attempts to mitigate some of its failings; her humanitarianism – the 'doctrinaire humanitarianism'; her range of economic policies; her religious views, her relationship with the Jesuits and Church/State relations in the period; her attitude towards the 'new philosophy'; the pragmatist who eased the way into a reforming age; her work on education and the universities in particular; her recruitment of able men of intellect, especially Haugwitz; the concept of a 'God fearing equality'; her intolerance.

AO2 – is 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 and 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.

Arguably for her time, she could be seen as enlightened and there is an argument that while her instincts may have been enlightened, realism and pragmatism pushed her in a different direction. Both terms need definition and reflection. She could be seen very much as a bridge between the worst of the ancient regime and the new.

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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

4 How important were economic factors to the development of Prussia in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

A wide range of factors could be considered as relevant to explaining the rise of Prussia in this period, such as: the quality and continuity of the ruler; the impact of the ‘composite’ state; taxation; quality administration; the bureaucracy; the army; foreign policy; primarily an agrarian state; poor communications; degree of government centralisation; the role of immigration; the weakness of both internal and external opponents; legal reform; the absence of religious strife; education; the internal colonisation, the new villages and adoption of English agricultural methods; support for industry; canals; reduction of trade barriers; good economics linked to military success; military ability.

AO2 – is 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 and 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.

Economics certainly played a part in the ‘development’ as opposed to just ‘territorial growth’. The two do need to be considered apart. Without a reasonable income and good management of that income, little could have been attained. However, the rulers themselves were vital and what is looked for is an identification of the key factors and valid reasons given for the order of priority suggested.

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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

5 Why was there so much international tension and conflict in Europe in the years 1721 to 1763?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

A wide range of factors which led to the growth of tension and conflict in the period, such as: commercial factors; colonialism; mercantilist sides; the example of 1739; naval factors – the role of acquiring sea power; specific conflict areas such as the Mediterranean, Africa, India and the Americas; the way in which foreign trade was so reliant on naval strength; the legacy of the peace settlements of 1713–4; traditional rivalries; the diplomatic ‘storm centres’ of the Mediterranean and the Baltic; the Alliance system – the Quadruple Alliance; individuals like Farnese; succession issues such as Poland; the rise of new powers such as Russia and Poland.

AO2 – is 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 and 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 explanation of the ‘so much’ is looked for and not just a list of causes. What was/were the key factor/s? To what extent was it just a continuation of traditional Europe-centred struggles and to what extent did non-European factors begin to dominate? How much can it be just put down to individual aspirations like those of Louis XV and Farnese, or perhaps pressure groups like those who pushed Walpole towards war in 1739?

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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

6 'The reign of Elizabeth of Russia was one of limited achievements.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

A range of factors could be considered, such as: partial recovery from a background of chaos; her remarkable seizure of power; the age of intrigue and palace revolutions; the emancipation of the nobility from service; the developments in education; the extension of serfdom; the decline of national finances; the continuation of anti-Western xenophobia; much more interested in clothes and fun and in political matters; a period of compromise and conciliation- she did not execute anyone; her foreign policy.

AO2 – is 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 and 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 some truth in the judgment, but it could be debated. Given the inheritance it could easily have been another 'time of troubles', but it was not. Simply by having a period of comparative peace credit could be gained. However the issue of the nobility and the serfs could lead to a valid argument that she did serious social harm.

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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

Section 2: c. 1774-1815

7 To what extent did Russia benefit from the rule of Catherine the Great?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

A very wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the introduction of more western ideas; her work on education; the failure of her political reforms; her failure to make legal changes; her inability to grasp Russian reality; her feeling that only autocracy would work in Russia; serfdom; the increase in noble powers; arguably, her policies stultified Russia's progress; unfulfilled expectations; the southern expansion making Russia into a feared superpower; her welcoming of foreign investment; whether her introduction of enlightenment ideas was a good idea; Pugachev; raising hopes only to destroy?

AO2 – is 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 and 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 implications of 'benefit' need to be thought through as it could be argued that expansion led to further conflict and the failure to think through what might really benefit Russia was highly damaging. What suited the 'West' was not necessarily good even then for the vast landmass that was Russia. What benefited a ruler and their autocracy might or might not be in the interests of Russia and its diverse people.

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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

**8 (Candidates offering 5f: The French Revolution should not answer this question.)
How important were bourgeois grievances in bringing about a revolution in France in 1789?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

A range of possible ‘bourgeois grievances’ needs to be identified, such as: the social divisions which existed in France; the tax inequality; the administrative and legal barriers which dominated the regions of France; the hostility to social, economic and political innovation of the Ancient Regime. There are a large number of other factors which could be considered, such as: poverty and hunger; the incompetence of the King and the Court’s refusal to compromise; the divisions within noble ranks and the reluctance of the First and Second Estates to accept change; the influence of new ideas (although they probably had greatest impact on the bourgeoisie); national bankruptcy.

AO2 – is 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 and 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.

What might be deemed to be ‘bourgeois’ grievances need to be identified and then they need to be balanced against the large number of other factors which led to the crisis of 1789. The focus should be on the date given, but if events which followed in, say, 1790, are utilised to give greater emphasis to points made, then that is acceptable. There is ample scope here for a serious historiographical debate, if that is the approach adopted.

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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

9 ‘Poland had greedy neighbours.’ Is this the best explanation for the country’s partitions?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

All three partitions need to be referred to: 1773, 1793 and 1795. Candidate may refer to: geographical factors playing a part; the absence of natural barriers; internal weaknesses and the way in which they were used to justify 1773 in particular; the Polish tendency to provoke, such as the work of Potocki in the 1780s against Russia and Prussia; the way in which Polish nobles played politics with Catherine of Russia and its implications for 1793; the motives of the Russians and the Prussians in 1793; the tendency of neighbours – such as the Austrians – to promote instability in Poland; the role of the ruling personalities in Russia, Austrian and Prussia. What is looked for is an identification of the principal causes of the three Partitions, and there may be different factors involved in all three, and then clear prioritising with reasons given why the chosen reason/s are more important than others. Just giving a list will not do here. There has to be real evidence of reflection, an identification of which were they key factors and why, for each of the Partitions.

AO2 – is 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 and 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.

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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

**10 (Candidates offering 5f: The French Revolution should not answer this question.)
What best explains the fall of Robespierre?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

A range of factors could be considered, such as: flaws in his own personality; the background of war; the degree of social and economic unrest; an inevitable outcome of the end of autocracy; violence had become a part of the governing process; another part of the crisis resulting from the execution of the King; loss of support from the Parisians and the execution of sans culottes; the changes in religion; innovation and terror; inflation; the result of too much liberty on a nation unused to it.

AO2 – is 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 and 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 simplest debate is one which balances the view that the reasons lie with his own failings with the one that he was very much a victim of the course of events over which no one had any control. The identification of a range of factors with valid reasons for their order of priority 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 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

11 How important was the Russian campaign of 1812 in bringing about the downfall of Napoleon?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the casualties involved; the incentive to other nations to attack; resources; military ability; the Iberian campaign; the excellent idea behind the Waterloo campaign but the errors in its execution; insecure support base in France; expectations of bourgeoisie from the government; proved too good at making enemies; overstretched; the ability of Wellington and the unwillingness of the British to give up; waking the Russian 'giant'.

AO2 – is 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 and 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 the Russian campaign, not just the losses, but also the impact on France's status and potential enemies, needs to be considered. Whether this was as important as the errors on the Waterloo campaign or the loss of patience by the French people needs to be debated. There may be different reasons given for the defeat as opposed to the overthrow and that should be welcomed.

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 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

Section 3: Themes c. 1715-c. 1815

12 Which is the more appropriate description of scientific development in the eighteenth century: 'Gradual evolution: rapid revolution'?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

A very wide range of factors and individuals could be covered, such as: inventions like the barometer, the microscope, the telescope, the steam pump, algebra and logarithms. The work of individuals such as Newton, Boyle, Galileo and Kepler, Descartes, Pascal and Leibniz. The focus could be on specific areas such as mathematics, astronomy, technology and chemistry.

AO2 – is 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 and 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.

Much will depend on a definition of revolution. If the state of science at the beginning of the century is compared with that at the end, then it could easily be argued that a fundamental change had taken place, particularly if areas such as astronomy and chemistry are looked at. However, it did take time, and the way in which the work of one man was gradually built on by another, the Pascal/Leibniz example is a good one here, then the 'gradual' answer is more likely.

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 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

13 How great an impact did the application of technology have on warfare in Europe in the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

The principal areas to examine are: weaponry, in particular the flintlock musket and the bayonet with their implications for the importance of the infantry. Naval developments should include the cannonade and copper sheathing. Fortifications became less important and could be a source of anachronistic reference.

AO2 – is 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 and 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.

This was an era of limited warfare and limited technological advance though the beginnings of the industrial revolution did have an impact at the end of the period. The importance of the flintlock musket and bayonet increased the importance and size of the infantry; this required greater organisation and discipline, which in turn reinforced the rise of the professional army and gave the European forces an advantage over the Ottoman Turks. For naval vessels the cannonade was a much lighter gun which used less powder, so more could be used thereby increasing firepower, especially at close range. Copper sheathing of hulls prevented marine growth and improved sailing performance. Up to 1780 the British who kept their ships at sea longer, had always found clean French ships faster and could therefore avoid battle; this was now no longer the case and meant months on blockade would not lead to any speed disadvantage. However, candidates might well conclude that technology did not have a dramatic impact in this era – it was very much a period between two eras of change – and that strategy, tactics, numbers and leadership were more significant, citing examples from the various wars (Austrian Succession, Seven Years, American Independence and Revolutionary).

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 15	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

14 How significant an influence did women have on cultural and intellectual life in the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

The principal areas to examine could include: politics and power (mistresses as well as monarchs), literature (letters, poetry and novels), performance arts (actresses and composers), painting (decorative and fine art), fashion and science.

AO2 – is 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 and 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.

Although women were still severely restricted in the eighteenth century (domination and subordination were the order of the day), we do see the emergence of many women who played an important role in cultural and intellectual activity. Indeed some of the most formidable rulers of this century were women – Maria Theresa and Catherine the Great in particular. In addition, Mary Wollstonecraft in England and both Olympe de Gouges and Madame Roland in France challenged the existing social order. However, despite these developments, candidates might well conclude that women of the eighteenth century merely paved the way for the achievements of those who followed- and there was still a long way to go.

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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

15 To what extent did the eighteenth century witness the decline of absolutism?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

A wide range of factors could be considered and the subject dealt with either in a broad ‘Europe wide’ way or by dealing with individual monarchs and countries; factors specific to Russia, France, Austria, Spain, Prussia and the Baltic and the Low Countries; the general acceptance of absolutism and the limited degree of challenge to the theories of Divine right; the greater degree of centralisation and central control seen as the century progressed; contemporary political thought; the growth of elements of the idea of consent – in Sweden, for example, after the death of Charles XII; Maria Theresa; the role and power of the nobility; office holding; examples like Poland.

AO2 – is 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 and 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 range of possible approaches is considerable and whether events in France after 1789 are factored in – even though they were to produce another autocrat. In many cases it thrived, but there is also ample evidence that in the growth of a bourgeois reluctant to accept an outdated social and economic order and interested in the ideas of men like Montesquieu, that change was in the air.

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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

16 Assess the importance of colonial trade to the European economy in the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

A very wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the huge growth in the Europe-colonial trade in the period, especially 1710–1760; vital for the Dutch, really put Holland on the map and kept it there; prime objective of the French and the English was to dominate this trade; French exports to colonies tripled in period; huge impact on towns; ports – such as Nantes, La Rochelle and Bordeaux; new merchant classes; new commodities; the economic balance between countries shifted; now Government departments to monitor it – such as in France in 1726; degree of legislation to control it; rise of the great Companies.

AO2 – is 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 and 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.

It was always important, as the attempts by so many of the able rulers to expand it showed. Given the degree of stagnation in much of agriculture and industry it represented a growth area which could be taxed as well as utilised to expand national wealth, security and status.

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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

17 Was the second half of the eighteenth century a period of stagnation for European agriculture and industry?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a 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.

A range of factors affecting a range of countries should be considered, such as: banking and its link to both; how Southern Europe remained agriculturally primitive; the degree of war damage to so many economies; the feudal reaction in Austria for example; a degree of agricultural development in the Baltic region, but it did not extent to trade and industry; limited in Germany as so atomised in structure with no free trade; Belgium the only real exception – with developments in agriculture along English lines as well as development of coal, iron and textile industries and improved communications; ‘in France men went into the barracks and in England into the factories’; the economic provincialism in France seen in both agricultural and industry, and in much of central and southern Europe.

AO2 – is 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 and 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.

Although there are exceptions such as in Belgium and in certain aspects in the Baltic region, by and large the answer is ‘yes’. Aristocratic and autocratic domination prevented much happening and unless there was a particularly interested ruler, like those in Prussia with agriculture, little happened.

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 19	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

Section 4: 1815–1862

18 ‘The Congress of Vienna created more problems than it solved.’ 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.

Candidates might consider: The Congress of Vienna’s decisions about ensuring security from France, of restoring the status quo in terms of Italy, of rewarding Prussia, of boosting the power of Austria and rewarding Britain.

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.

Critical responses might point to the dangers of ignoring nationalism, for example in Belgium, in Poland and in Italy. The attempts to maintain the old order may be seen as short-sighted. However, France was excluded and resentful and did not threaten European peace. Whether the rewards to Prussia created the basis for a more powerful Germany that was ultimately a problem may be discussed, but in terms of shorter-term aims of developing a counterpoise to France and establishing a balance of power, some success may be claimed.

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.

Page 20	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

19 How effective was the foreign policy of Nicholas I?

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 consider: the cooperation with France and Britain over Greece, and the war with Turkey; the concerns of the Tsar to maintain a weak Ottoman Empire rather than to allow its demise and the Treaty of Adrianople; the opening of the Straits to international commerce; the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi and the subsequent backing down at the Straits Convention; the Tsar's visit to Britain in 1844; the Tsar's reaffirmation of the Holy Alliance and his role in suppressing European revolutions; the Russo-Turkish war of 1853 and the Crimean 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 of different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required.

Candidates need to consider: the aims of Russian policy in terms of the Eastern Question; Russia as protector of the Orthodox Christians and its strategic and economic goals; and, the defence of the monarchical authority in Europe. Effective diplomacy led to joint action to protect the Greeks in 1828 and the Tsar prevented the partition of Turkey and, for a while, maintained a weak Ottoman empire under Russian protection, but he had to accept the limitations of this. However, the opening of the straits to commerce saw the development of Odessa as a trading centre. He maintained good relations with other powers until 1853 and cooperated with the monarchs of Austria and Prussia to maintain the status quo, eradicating the Republic of Cracow and ending the Hungarian Revolt in 1848. Candidates might discuss whether the aims were realistic and how the limitations of Russian abilities to persuade other powers to cooperate over the future of Turkey were revealed in 1853.

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.

Page 21	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

20 Who was the better king: Louis XVIII or Louis Philippe?

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 principal areas of close comparison would be how each monarch handled politics and government, the economy, the church, the people, and 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 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.

Both monarchs had difficult accessions – Louis XVIII had two (!) and republicans felt the 1830 Revolution had been ‘stolen’. Louis XVIII was successful in steering a middle course between extremes though Ultra influence grew after 1820; Louis Philippe was also successful for many years until a combination of a mishandled economic downturn and ignored political demands led to his overthrow. Louis XVIII’s economic crisis occurred at the beginning of his reign and after 1818 there was a period of relative prosperity. Louis XVIII’s foreign policy was also successful: France was welcomed back into the great power fold and intervention in Spain was a success. Arguably Louis Philippe’s foreign policy was not so successful: the ‘missed opportunity’ over Belgium and the climb down over both Mehemet Ali and Tahiti in order to keep on Britain’s good side, were deeply unpopular acts.

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.

Page 22	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

21 How much did the unification of Germany owe to the growth of German nationalism?

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 might consider the growth of nationalism, the *Nationalverein*, the greater unity brought about by economic developments and cultural nationalism. There was also a wave of nationalism following the 1866 war. Other factors include: the military and economic power which allowed Prussia to defeat Denmark, Austria and France; and, the diplomacy of Bismarck which allowed Prussia to isolate its enemies and overcome the barriers to unification that had existed previously, and to secure the non-interference of Russia.

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.

There is a debate possible about whether German nationalism equated to any national desire to see the strengthening of Prussia. Bismarck had little sympathy for ‘the national swindle’ and nationalist idealism had not succeeded in achieving unification in 1848–49. By decoupling Nationalism and Liberalism, Bismarck achieved unification by diplomatic and military means; however, this was in the context of some increase in national enthusiasm.

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.

Page 23	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

22 'A united Italy was made possible more by foreigners than Italians.' Was it?

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 efforts of Italians might be seen in the diplomacy of Cavour, the patriotic societies, the influence of Mazzini and the popular support for the heroism of Garibaldi and his followers. The influence of foreigners might be seen in: the contribution of Napoleon III in defeating Austria; the support offered by Britain; the role of Prussia in defeating Austria in 1866, and allowing Venice to be part of the new Italy, and causing France to take its forces from Rome in 1870.

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.

Issues that might be discussed are whether nationalism was a strong enough force, given the prevalence of localism and the considerable indifference to a new national state to bring about the necessary defeat of Austria and the forging of a new state. Austrian military power had been decisive in 1848 and without its defeat unification would not have been possible. However, Cavour used the support of Napoleon III not for national unity, but for the extension of Piedmont, and the French did not sustain the alliance. The unification was a result of nationalist enthusiasm and Garibaldi forcing the pace of change. The role of Britain could be assessed in relation to the Sicilian expedition. Even in 1861, Italy was not unified and the new state was not strong enough to gain Venice and Rome by itself, but nationalism did put pressure on to gain these key areas.

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.

Page 24	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

Section 5: 1862–1914

23 Did the reforms of Alexander II do more to damage than preserve Tsarism?

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 may focus on the emancipation of the serfs, but a wider consideration of changes is needed including: educational change, the creation of Zemestva, relaxation of the tight controls of Nicholas I on censorship and army reforms.

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.

The issue is whether the reforms created an appetite for reform which they could not satisfy and increased unrest, for example in Poland and in the development of the *narodniks*, and political terrorism. Or, on the other hand, whether the reforms helped to preserve the regime by offering modernisation, some outlet for criticism, an end to an old fashioned social system and by developing a more modern army after the defeats of 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.

Page 25	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

24 ‘Bismarck’s domestic policies after 1871 destroyed German Liberalism.’ 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.

Candidates might consider: the constitution that Bismarck developed with the built-in advantages for Prussia and the limited power offered to the Reichstag; his manipulation of the parties and the ending of the alliance with the National Liberals; his illiberal attempts to destroy the Centre and the Socialists; and, the independence of the army from budgetary control.

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.

The debate is whether the Bismarck era did have some key Liberal features. Standing against papal obscurantism could be seen as supporting the Liberal cause in a wider sense, even if illiberal measures were used and the Kulturkampf was pursued through parliamentary means. The aims of the Socialists were not those of Liberal Germany, but, again, there were illiberal means to attempt to suppress them, which did not prevent the increase in their support. Bismarck pursued economic liberalism initially, but then resorted to tariffs. He also maintained the federal structure protecting the more liberal states. It might be argued that German liberalism had been fatally compromised before 1871 by the Indemnity Bill and its enthusiasm for Prussian military power.

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.

Page 26	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

25 What best explains why failures in war led to the end of the Tsarist regime in 1917, but not in 1905?

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 1905 revolution was a serious threat to the regime, but it was possible for concessions to divide opposition and take the pressure off the Tsar. By 1917, the scale of casualties and disillusion with the conduct of the war and the limited results of the concessions made in 1905–6 made it unlikely that further promises of change would be able to stop unrest.

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.

Answers may analyse the role of the army, contrasting its underlying loyalty in 1905 with the failure to suppress unrest in 1917. The scale and impact of the war with Japan in 1904–5 and the much more extended and costly fighting in the First World War may be compared. The options for concession were greater in 1905, but the limited impact of the agrarian reforms and the restrictions on the power of the Dumas reduced the credibility of any further concessions in 1917. Better answers will offer some weighing of different 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.

Page 27	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

26 ‘The defeat of France in 1940 was only a symptom, not a cause, of the death of the Third Republic.’ 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.

Answers may focus on whether the problems of the Third Republic in the inter-war period meant that its demise did not come about as a result of defeat, but that the defeat and death of the Republic was determined by existing divisions and weaknesses.

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.

Analyses may consider: the internal divisions with some fearing the Popular Front and the union of the left (‘Better Hitler than Blum’); the economic problems of inter-war France; the lack of will to defend the post-war settlement; and, the reluctance to commit to full scale war and reliance on a defensive strategy. The alternative is that the suddenness of defeat because of the Blitzkrieg strategy brought on the end of the Republic, regardless of pre-war problems and divisions.

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.

Page 28	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

27 Who should bear most responsibility for the fact that the Sarajevo crisis of 1914 led to the First World War only weeks later?

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 assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand led to an Austrian ultimatum to Serbia. The reactions of the Great Powers to the results of that should be considered in the wider context of international relations before 1914.

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.

The policy of Austria to bring about a solution to the South Slav problem by war might be seen as the key, but without the involvement of other powers this was a local conflict. The role of Russia in supporting Serbia might be seen as a reaction to the loss of influence in the Far East and a determination to maintain her interests in the Balkans, and to use her strengthened forces even if full scale European war resulted. Germany's decision to support Austria might be seen in terms of wanting to wage preventative war in the east or even as a result of longer term expansionist aims. Even if this did risk war on two fronts, the confidence in the Schlieffen Plan resulted in a willingness to bring on a wider European War. France did have treaty obligations, but her decision might be seen in the light of a growing nationalism, military expansion and hopes for British intervention. Britain's position had not been clear and there was a sense of obligation to France and a belief in the need to confront Germany in some elements of the foreign office. A discussion of relative responsibility rather than an explanation of the roles of the powers will characterise 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.

Page 29	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

Section 6: Themes c. 1815–1914

28 What best explains the survival of the Habsburg Empire after the defeats of 1859 and 1866?

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 1815, Austria was powerful enough to maintain control over the Bund and prevent the Erfurt Union offering any alternative. It had defeated revolts in Italy in 1848 and recovered from the disturbances in Austria and Hungary. However, in economic terms, Austria had not kept up with Prussia and, in military terms, its tactics, generalship and weaponry were proved to be inferior in the wars of independence. It was not strong enough to take advantage of Prussia's war in 1870 and was forced to give Hungary equal status in 1867 with the *Ausgleich*, and to become a junior partner in alliance with the new Germany. Increasing nationalism threatened stability in its disparate empire, yet it survived and was able to wage a costly war for four years until its dismemberment in 1918.

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.

The survival might be explained by the limitations and divisions within possible opposition and nationalist movements; by the ability of the empire to deal with local elites; by the restricted appeal of nationalism in less developed areas and by the threat of Russian domination; by the maintenance of a large army which, if ineffective against well trained foreign forces, could suppress local unrest; by tradition and loyalty to the *KuK*; by some concessions, for example suffrage extension; and, by the lack of viable alternatives given the considerable national/racial mix in the regions of the empire, as was apparent in the new states after 1918.

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.

Page 30	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

29 Did European overseas empires increase the prestige more than the power of the colonising European nations 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.

This could include the Scramble for Africa, but also the desire for trade with China and new colonial possessions in Southeast Asia (e.g. French 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 of different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required.

Possible increases in power could be economic exploitation (e.g. the Belgian Congo) or strategic advantage. Bismarck's colonisation had motives concerned with domestic politics and putting pressure on Britain, but did relatively little for German power. French expansion was linked to the need for prestige after 1870, but the acquisitions added responsibilities to France rather than becoming a very important power within in the region, or in Europe. Italian colonisation was associated with domestic pressures and may have raised prestige, though the land acquired did not augment power. There is an argument that the diversion of resources to protect or acquire the new empires actually made countries more vulnerable, for example, the Italian losses in Ethiopia.

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.

Page 31	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

30 'A tasteless and feverish pursuit of emotion at all costs.' Assess this view of Romanticism in any one of the arts 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.

Romanticism had developed earlier and could be seen as a pursuit of individual expression over form, leading to vibrant but personal works of art. In opposition to the more formal culture of the eighteenth century, there was a love of the picturesque, a personal and emotional response to nature as wild beauty, an interest in folk culture and an exploration of the supernatural and irrational.

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.

For some, the high Romanticism of the period is a high point in European culture, with grandeur, heightened emotion, intense personal expression, and exploitation of technical developments. For others, especially in the post-First World War reaction, the period is noted for artificial and grandiose work, banal content masked by sheer scale, an over-reliance on personal reaction at the expense of cohesion and a retreat from the disciplines of form. The answer should explore some of these themes in *one* art form and argument will need relevant exemplification to carry conviction.

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.

Page 32	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

31 Why was there so much anti-clericalism in nineteenth-century thinking?

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.

As both Liberalism and Marxism were hostile to clericalism and as there was a great deal of rationalist and science-based thought which was opposed by the Catholic Church, it did seem that there was a clash of civilisations – one rational forward-looking, evidence-based, the other backward-looking, reliant on tradition and belief not scientific proof.

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.

Answers might consider the impact of scientific developments and the interest in empirical testing of supposed knowledge. Growth in archaeology, in textual scholarship and historical thinking offered possibilities to challenge religious beliefs and the reaction by the Church produced anti-clericalism. The association of the church with political reaction and its opposition to liberalism and nationalism produced anti-clericalism. The rise of an urban middle-class culture led some thinkers to equate clericalism with backwardness and ‘the idiocy of rural life’. It might be argued that technological change made progress into a ‘religion’ and anticlericalism into a crusade.

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.

Page 33	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

32 What best accounts for rapid industrial growth in Europe in 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.

Overall industrial growth was considerable and happened very rapidly in some countries. For example, Italy and Russia experienced industrial growth in the later part of the century and Germany both before and after Unification.

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.

Explanations might include technological developments, especially steel production in the second half of the century and engineering and mining developments. The knock-on effects included: growth of railways and steam ships; the growth of population to provide both labour and markets; the growth of capital, banking and finance; the demand of states for arms; the developments of overseas empires; and, the openness of elites and rulers to capitalist developments, even in autocratic states. Better answers might offer some distinctions between different areas and some judgements about the relative importance of 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.

Page 34	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

33 Did demographic change harm Europe 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.

The considerable increase in Europe's population and the balance between urban and rural areas might be considered in the light of its impact on: economic development; urbanisation; cultural development; the growth of nationalism and political developments with mass electorates; colonialism; and, even military change with larger forces. It is not necessary to deal with every ramification and no set response is expected.

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.

Benefits might be seen in terms of: urban growth; mass markets, industrial development and opportunities for agriculture; larger and potentially stronger states more able to support populations more by economic growth; and, opportunities in colonies. Disadvantages may be seen in: famines – for example in Russia; in unemployment and poor living conditions in cities; in the emotional turmoil of mass emigration; in pressure on resources; and, the tendency for states to create larger armed forces with the danger of conflict. Better answers will offer a judgement supported with 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.

Page 35	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

Section 7: 1914–1945

34 How far was Germany responsible for its defeat in 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. Answers might consider strategic and tactical decisions made by Germany as a factor and also the strengths and determination of Germany’s enemies and the weaknesses of its allies by the end of the 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 of different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required.

Arguments for Germany being responsible might focus on the failure to anticipate a protracted two-front war and unrealistic expectations of a rapid French defeat. Despite successes in the East, maintaining two fronts was a considerable drain on resources. The Verdun campaign can be seen as flawed and dependent on a costly attritional strategy after initial successes. The diffusion of resources to additional fronts such as Italy may be seen as the fault of Austria but the failure of the 1918 offensive in the West was a failure of resources. The entry of the USA may be seen as the responsibility of German decisions about U-boat warfare and adventurism in Mexico.

On the other hand, the relentless pressure of French and British attacks, the willingness to endure very high casualties by Germany’s enemies, and the skills of a coordinated allied strategy in 1918, can be seen as key. Also, the collapse of Austria-Hungary and Turkey at a crucial time in 1918, can be seen as beyond Germany’s control.

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.

Page 36	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

35 (Candidates offering 5j: Russia in Revolution should not answer this question.)
'Not a revolution but a seizure of power.' Assess this view of the events of October 1917 in 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 focus should be on the context of October 1918, nature of the October Revolution, the degree of support for the Bolsheviks, and the significance of the subsequent opposition.

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.

The Bolshevik defence of the events of October as a revolution lies in: the increased support for the Bolsheviks; the view that the bourgeois revolution had been established and the time was ripe for a proletarian revolution in terms of Marxist theory; in the unpopularity and unrepresentative nature of the provisional government; and, the belief in the policies of the April Theses. The counter view is that there may have been support for some of the policies of Lenin, but there was much less support for the total ideology, as was shown in the elections for the Constituent Assembly which was anyway dismissed in January 1918. The major revolutionary group was the SRs, not the Bolsheviks, and the Mensheviks argued that there was not a true revolutionary situation. The revolution was more like a coup with small groups taking key points in Petrograd and Moscow, not a mass movement through the country. Not all of the Bolshevik party favoured a coup and it was driven through by Lenin to take power, while it was possible at a time of weakness in the aftermath of the Kornilov incident. The subsequent opposition revealed that this was more a takeover than a popular revolution and it is in considerable contrast with the mass demonstrations of February.

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.

Page 37	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

**36 (Candidates offering 5I: Germany 1919-45 should not answer this question.)
By when can it be most plausibly claimed that the Weimar Republic was doomed?**

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 deals with explanations of the end of Weimar and answers might consider the origins of the Republic, the different crisis it faced before the depression, the impact of the depression and the circumstances of the accession of Hitler to office and power.

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.

It might be possible that the circumstances of a harsh peace, internal revolts and extremism and economic problems meant that the Republic was doomed from the start. Some may argue that the crisis of 1923 with its crippling inflation, the weakness shown by the French invasion and the failure to deal adequately with the Hitler putsch, was the point which doomed Weimar as it led Hitler to adopt the key policy of legality and the inflation undermined the middle class. It might be argued that the prosperous years made Weimar far more acceptable and likely to succeed. The Crash of 1929 made its demise inevitable, as it led to the rapid growth of the extremist vote. However, there is a view that the Communists did not have enough support outside the industrial working class, the Nazis were actually losing support in the autumn of 1932 and that some sort of republic, even one with more authoritarian elitist rule, could have survived as late as November 1932 had it not been for in-fighting, and the fatal decision of Von Papen to ally with Hitler. Even then, the army might have got rid of the Nazis as late as 1934. No set response is expected. Better answers will offer a judgement and compare different possible views.

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.

Page 38	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

37 'The victory of the USSR in the Second World War was made possible only by the harsh measures taken by Stalin before and during the war.' How valid is this judgement?

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 harsh measures may include the ensuring of food supplies by enforced collectivisation; the growth of industry, which could produce vital war supplies; the repressive political control, which ensured discipline and obedience; the control of the nationalities.

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.

The case for the harsh measures being key lies in the ability of the USSR to take vast casualties and remain committed to defending the country; being able to move industrial areas and having the technical and industrial ability to replace the great losses of 1941–42 and supply heavy artillery, rockets, tanks, etc. Unquestioning discipline led to the Red Army absorbing considerable losses and the belief in Stalin may have been a sustaining element, together with the use of propaganda. Against this, the weakening of the Red Army in the purges and Stalin's refusal to heed warnings led to the disasters of 1941 which brought the USSR close to defeat. The repressive policies of the Nazis, rather than love of Stalin and the regime, may have been the key motivator; there were poor strategic decisions taken by Stalin and heavy casualties resulted from unsophisticated military methods. Overstretch on the part of the Germans, their unwise policy of not trying to get the support of national groups and opponents of the regime together, with poor decisions, for example at Stalingrad, and Russia's distances and weather, may have been more important.

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.

Page 39	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

38 'The Spanish Left was responsible for both the outbreak and the outcome of the Spanish Civil War.' How valid is this judgement?

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 creation of the second republic in 1931 began a period of intense division and crisis in Spain which led to a military coup and the subsequent division of the country. Anti-clericalism, social and political unrest and the creation of the Popular Front alarmed conservative elements, especially in the army. The growth of political unrest and the rise of extremism on both the left and the right in the context of a Europe split ideologically between Fascism and communism led to war. The foreign help given to the Nationalists, and their military skill and equipment, contrasted with the more divided Republican 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 of different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required.

Answers may weigh the increasing threat from right-wing organisations like the Falange, the repression of unrest for example in the Asturias 1934, the plotting of the generals and the coup against a legitimate government assisted by Germany as contra indications. However, the overt anticlericalism, the rise of extreme anarchism and syndicalism, political murders such as that of Calvo Sotelo in July 1936, and the danger in the eyes of conservative Spaniards of national disintegration, for example with Catalan separatism and the fear of the USSR, might be considered. In terms of the war, the divisions within the Republicans, the struggles between different factions and regions, together with some weak leadership, might be weighed against the substantial direct military aid offered by Mussolini and Hitler, and the dogged determination of Franco, greater air power and the support of the Spanish church. No set answer is required and the propositions are certainly open to challenge.

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.

Page 40	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

39 Who should bear more responsibility for the Second World War: the dictators or the appeasers?

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 focus is on the policies of Hitler to revise the Treaty of Versailles, re-arm, gain allies and take German-speaking areas into the Reich up to 1938, and then to begin expansion by taking Moravia and Bohemia. Appeasers first of all did not take effective action to stop this and then adopted a more proactive stance to try and meet German grievances to prevent war, or at least gain time for rearmament and preparation for a defensive war. Mussolini could be blamed for breaking the Stresa Front and because of the war in Ethiopia allying with Hitler.

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.

It could be argued that Hitler had wider policy aims of Lebensraum and was determined to build up forces to expand eastwards to eradicate 'Judeo-Bolshevism' and provide new lands for a major German colonisation to establish a firm basis for the Volk for generations to come. In that sense, his determination to change the balance of power in Europe and use force for expansion should be seen as being responsible. However, the counter argument is that failure to defend treaties and protect threatened nations by France and Britain allowed war to happen. The appeasers ignored their responsibilities for maintaining Versailles and Locarno or in France's case supporting its eastern allies. By failing to see Hitler as not a 'normal' statesman but as a racist fanatic, the appeasers allowed him to rearm, break treaties, expand and gave him confidence to demand more – in the event from Poland which began the war. NB This is not a question about why appeasement was carried out, but about its consequences in making war more likely.

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.

Page 41	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

Section 8: 1945–2000

40 How well did the French Fourth Republic deal France’s post-war problems?

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 concerns the problems of the recovery of France from occupation and war. These included: inflation; the need to establish stable government without too much presidential power; and the need to recover France’s international position; and, unrest in the empire.

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.

The Republic has been criticised for: a weak executive with unstable coalitions; engaging in a futile war in Vietnam which was lost; Suez, in allowing the Algerian situation to escalate by repression; and, having to hand over power to de Gaulle. In its defence, a parliamentary regime was established which was responsive to the electorate. Against that, despite problems with inflation, France gained from: the European Coal and Steel Community: planning measures; and, modernisation in agriculture. Despite the deep divisions of the Vichy period, parliamentary government was maintained and some of France’s colonies passed peacefully to independence. The struggle in Algeria was not typical, but represented a major problem.

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.

Page 42	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

41 Did the successful development of West Germany in the period 1945 to 1990 owe more to Adenauer or to his successors?

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 scope of this question might encompass the establishment of the basic law and political stability; the economic recovery; the relationship with the Nazi past; West Germany's reintegration into world affairs; the problems of terrorism; Ostpolitik; and, relations with the East and reunion.

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.

Adenauer's role might be seen in terms of his relationship with the USA and his resistance to Communism; the economic miracle; the maintenance of political stability and a strong federal government, but a lack of any commitment to reunification and opposition to the East, together with some problems at the end of his rule and a failure to meet the needs of a younger generation. His successors had to deal with more internal unrest and slower economic growth. Brandt's period of office (1969–74) was noticeable for a rapprochement with the East and Kohl managed the reunification. Many will see Adenauer as the key figure, but his successors had to deal with vital issues and there could be an argument that both Ostpolitik and reunification were more significant to the development of West Germany. No set view 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.

Page 43	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

42 Was Stalin or Truman more responsible for the development of the Cold War in the period from 1945 to 49?

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 period deals with the Potsdam Conference and its aftermath; the Russian expansion into eastern Europe; the policies of Containment, including the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, the problems with Germany, Czechoslovakia; and, the creation of Cominform and Comecon, and Nato.

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.

Truman has been seen as being insensitive to Soviet security concerns and adopting an over-confrontational style; the ‘dollar diplomacy’ of the Marshall Plan has been criticised as has the failure to recognise that Stalin did not interfere in Greece; and, the creation of the currency union in Germany has been seen as provocative. On the other hand, the Soviet tactics in ensuring control in eastern Europe, the purges of political opponents and the apparent failure to respect decisions about elections, together with the events in Czechoslovakia and the Berlin Blockade, have been seen as Stalin’s bringing about conflict. A ‘post revisionist’ synthesis may emerge, but descriptions of schools of thought should not be over-rewarded in themselves. Supported judgement is required.

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.

Page 44	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

43 'He tried to do too much, too fast.' How valid is this judgement on Gorbachev's domestic reforms?

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 scope of the answer is the domestic reforms within the USSR – Perestroika and Glasnost, the negotiations with the satellite states and the popular demonstrations which brought down the Berlin Wall. The internal opposition within Russia to change and the results of the end of Communist rule might 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 of different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required.

There is the view that the rapid ending of the economic system and the introduction of free market reforms caused: short-term upheavals resulting in Gorbachev's fall and the internal crisis; Russia losing control of her 'empire' too quickly; and the pace of diplomatic change being too fast to be in the interests of Russia. The alternative is to consider that the stagnation of the post-Khrushchev era, the lack of economic growth, the problems of the Brezhnev doctrine, and the results of the war in Afghanistan amounted to a situation in which decisive and fast-paced change were essential, despite the hardships for some, and the problems of readjustment and loss of power.

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.

Page 45	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

44 Can Franco's rule in Spain from 1945 to 1975 be convincingly defended?

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 scope is the diplomatic, economic, political and social developments of Spain between 1945 and 1975.

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.

Franco established a brutal and repressive dictatorship which treated its former enemies in a violent and vindictive way. The war brought about by the 1936 coup left considerable physical, economic and emotional damage. By establishing good relations with the USA in the post-war era, Franco avoided the fate of his fellow dictators and gained aid. By using technocrats, Spain's economy revived and the tourist industry was developed. Franco avoided the excesses of Fascism and kept his Falangist allies at a distance. While not being prepared to compromise in terms of political reform, he paved the way for change and the restoration of a monarchy which would adopt the constitutional path. No set judgement is required.

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.

Page 46	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

Section 9: Themes c. 1914–2000

45 How well did European states deal with the consequences of urbanisation 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.

Consequences of urbanisation could include: the provision of services, urban planning, the need for communications, the problems of the inner cities and conservation, the imbalance between town and countryside, the spread of urban crime and the spread of political ideas and urban culture.

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.

Answers could consider: post-war solutions to housing needs and the problems brought about by high rise construction; and, overcrowding in poorer areas being addressed in variable ways. There has been imaginative town planning and the establishment of controls of construction in some cities, but, in others, new developments have dated and become problems in terms of overcrowding, crime and a newer generation of residents without historic connections to the area have created a societal gap between historic city centres and suburbs. In some cities, there has been a major increase in investment in urban transport systems, in others the communications have remained dated. Traffic has been managed better in some cities than others. Some cities have had very substantial property price rises which have created problems. Some distinction may be made between eastern and western Europe, between capital cities and provincial cities, and in time periods. Better answers will provide convincing exemplification.

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.

Page 47	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

46 'Decolonisation affected the mother countries of Europe as profoundly as it did their former colonies.' How valid is 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.

The effects of decolonisation on former colonies might include the need to establish economic and political stability and to deal with problems caused by colonisation, in creating what were sometimes artificial states with varied ethnic or linguistic groups. Decolonisation led to border disputes, to loss of trade and to the emergence of one-party states; but, it also led to a sense of freedom and empowerment. The effects on the mother countries varied and could include some economic consequences and political effects and disputes.

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.

In some cases, there was limited interest in and attachment to colonies, so their loss made limited difference except in terms of loss of job opportunities and the return of settlers. In other countries, the result was far more significant; for example, in France, where the loss of Indo-China made nationalists anxious to avoid the loss of Algeria and led to major divisions about the policy there which brought down the Republic. Economic and cultural links continued in some cases between the former mother country and the newly independent states

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.

Page 48	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

47 'The greatest failure of the European Union up to 2000 was its inability to exert an integrated European influence on world affairs.' 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 scope of this is a consideration of what has been the role of the EU in world affairs. This could be seen in terms of major crises, but also in the longer term issues of aid and development.

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.

Answers may argue that it is misguided to see this as an element of failure as the main aim has not been to exert Europe's influence, but rather to provide the opportunity for discussion of world affairs and to offer Europe a voice. It might be argued from this that failures, if at all, should be seen in terms of more explicitly stated aims. There might be an argument that as the EU has grown and become more diverse, then it has become more difficult, especially without the means of armed intervention and, with only limited capacity, to impose sanctions to influence world affairs. A counter view would be that within the limitations of its role and institutions, then influence has been exerted by aid and development programmes.

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.

Page 49	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

**48 ‘The effects of two world wars on the role and status of women have been exaggerated.’
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 effects that might be considered are: the political changes in franchise extension; the extended employment opportunities; participation in the national war effort in some European states; or, in resistance activities. It could be argued that social changes as a result of war have affected the role and status of women.

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.

The quote questions the accepted view that war gave women: more experience of doing traditional male work; brought them away from the home; more experience and travel; and, confidence in doing new tasks – flying planes, driving, doing skilled engineering work, etc. The wars also resulted in changes in the franchise and, if the war is seen as bringing about Communism and Nazism, a new political role in attempts to construct a new society. Here, though, it could be argued that women’s progress was retarded. A counter view is that traditional attitudes returned as a reaction to wars and that it took more than the wars to bring about changes in discrimination and to male attitudes, for example, the impact of the US feminist movement, long term educational change, contraception, smaller families, changes in the home and legislation for equal pay.

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.

Page 50	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

49 ‘Shallow and over-rated.’ Assess this view of the arts in Europe in the 1920s and 1930s.

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 art forms might include painting, architecture, music, drama and literature. Answers might consider the art encouraged by totalitarian regimes and reactions to high romanticism like neo-classicism and new forms like art deco.

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.

One view is that in reacting to the romantic and representational art of the pre-war period, the arts achieved a freshness and lightness that were far from shallow except in pre-war terms. Art at its best showed a willingness to experiment (Picasso, the Russian constructivists, Walton’s ‘Façade’, musical neo classicism, etc.) Some distinguished figures continued pre-war trends – Chagall, Kandinsky, Stravinsky, Strauss, and Elgar. Others responded to new stimuli like jazz or US building styles. Major architectural schools emerged (Bauhaus) and ‘new reality’ aesthetics were far from shallow (Hindemith, Weill). The counter view is that: functionalism was ugly; Nazi, fascist and Soviet art was derivative and bourgeois; pre-war figures like Strauss had done their best work before this period; there was a cult of the trivial (Les Six); and, works which aimed to shock were often feeble (Walton’s *Façade*) or dominated by theory (Schoenberg). Better answers will offer convincing exemplification, but no set view 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.

Page 51	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	23

50 How important was the political influence of the mass media 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.

The mass media could include radio, TV, cinemas, the press and the internet.

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.

Answers might draw a distinction between the conscious use of mass media by regimes – propaganda in dictatorial regimes and the effects of mass media on political attitudes, e.g. information about western consumerism on the Soviet bloc. ‘Political’ could be taken in a very broad sense, with mass media supporting attitudes which could be seen as ‘political’ in the sense of strengthening or weaken adherence to an underlying system rather a particular party or specific political policies.

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.