

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2011 question paper  
for the guidance of teachers**

**9697 HISTORY**

**9697/13**

Paper 1, maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

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

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

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

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>13</b>

### GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Examiners will assess which Level of Response best reflects most of the answer. An answer will not be required to demonstrate all of the descriptions in a particular Level to qualify for a Mark Band.

<b>Band</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Levels of Response</b>
1	21–25	The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material and ideas. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The best answers must be awarded 25 marks.
2	18–20	Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided.
3	16–17	Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.
4	14–15	Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively.
5	11–13	Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.
6	8–10	Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.
7	0–7	Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent. Marks at the bottom of this Band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answers usually make at least a few valid points.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	13

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

SOURCE-BASED QUESTION: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

'Germany's policies in Morocco from 1905 to 1911 were completely unjustified.' Use Sources A–E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2–3]	EVALUATION [L4–5]	CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER (e.g. contextual knowledge)
A	A report to his government by a German diplomat.	The Kaiser, representing German policy, treated Morocco as an independent country. Germany wanted to be treated on equal terms with other (European) countries. The visit was a success.	N – The aims of the Kaiser and his government were honourable. The 1905 visit to Morocco was a success for Germany. N – Although it might be considered reliable as a diplomat's report, it is very one-sided, ignoring the tensions caused by the Kaiser's visit.	Y – B agrees by justifying German policy. Y – C agrees by justifying German policy. N – D disagrees in a severe condemnation of German policy. N – E sees German policy as a failure.	Y – The visit to Morocco in 1905 fits with German ambitions to have a larger role in North Africa. Y – The Sultan of Morocco was not an independent ruler. France enjoyed hegemony as part of the Entente Cordiale. N – The Kaiser and the writer of the source ignore likely reactions in France and possible reactions in Britain. N – The Kaiser did not want Morocco to remain completely independent but wanted German influence there.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>13</b>

<b>B</b>	A report to his government by a German diplomat.	Britain's attitude to Germany had changed from friendship to hostility. Morocco had been used as an excuse to strengthen France. Britain misrepresented Germany's aims. Germany and Britain wished to avoid war. The Kaiser's notes first agree with the summary but then add an enthusiastic comment about the likelihood of war.	N – The Ambassador's summary justifies Germany and criticises Britain. The Kaiser backs him up. Y – The second note by the Kaiser indicates that he was not unwilling to go to war. This can refer to Morocco by implication. Y – The extract is very probably an accurate version of the diplomat's report to his government. It represented widespread feeling in Germany. Y – The Kaiser's notes are authentic and can be accepted as his point of view.	Y – A agrees by justifying German policy. Y – C agrees by justifying German policy. N – D disagrees in a severe condemnation of German policy. N – E sees German policy as unwise and a failure.	Y – The reference to Morocco as an issue between Britain and Germany can be expanded. Y – The wider context of Anglo-German relations can be explored. High credit can be given if candidates point out that relations were generally improving by 1908. Y – The Kaiser's personal views and influence can be explained, especially in relation to Morocco.
<b>C</b>	A report by a German diplomat to a leading German nationalist.	The extract is a combination of extravagant nationalism and a justification of German needs to expand in Morocco.	N – The source justifies Germany's position in Morocco. N – It is very one-sided and its nationalist audience reflects its partiality.	Y – A agrees by justifying German policy. Y – B agrees by justifying German policy. N – D disagrees in a severe condemnation of German policy. N – E sees German policy as a failure.	Y – Candidates can comment on nationalism in Germany and the consequences for diplomacy. N – The source ignores French interests in Morocco, linked with other north African territories.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>13</b>

D	A later memoir by a leading British politician.	The 1911 incident was a serious blunder by Germany in its aims, execution and outcome. Germany withdrew when faced with the possibility of joint action by Britain and France.	Y – Lloyd George criticises German policy as unjustified and leading to failure. N – Memoirs are not likely to be objective. The writer was representing British interests, shaped especially by the ensuing war.	Y – E sees German policy as a failure. N – A sees the 1905 visit as a success. N – B justifies German policy. N – C justifies German policy.	Y – The source can be linked to wider relations between Britain, France and Germany. Y – The personal influence of the Kaiser on diplomacy can be examined. N – Britain did not use Morocco as an excuse to set France against Germany. Y/N – British public opinion in 1905–11 was divided. It was not as completely anti-German as indicated.
E	A recent view of a British historian.	The crises in 1905 and 1911 were intended to divide Britain and France but had the opposite effect.	Y – The facts mentioned in the source are accurate. Y/N – A distinction can be made between facts and interpretation. Some candidates might accept a modern historian's reliability unquestioningly. Very good candidates might suggest that there are alternative explanations but are not expected to name historians.	Y – D sees German policy as a failure. But the tone of E is more measured. N – A sees the 1905 visit as a success. N – B justifies German policy. N – C justifies German policy.	Y – The source is a fair summary of, and comment on, the two Morocco crises. In particular, it shows how the crises strengthened the Entente.

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

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	13

## 1 Source-Based Question

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

These answers write generally about the causes of the 1914 war but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information / evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss *'Germany's policies in Morocco from 1905 to 1911 were completely unjustified'* but will describe events very generally. Include in this level answers which use information taken from the sources but only in providing a summary of views expressed by the writers, rather than for testing the hypothesis. Alternatively, the sources might be ignored in a general essay answer.

### L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE **OR** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6–8]

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation / interpretation in context.

For example, *'Germany's policies in Morocco from 1905 to 1911 were completely unjustified. Source D shows that France had international treaty rights in Morocco after the 1905 crisis and that Germany was unwilling to accept this but sought compensation. The 1911 crisis was caused by Germany's policies which were badly handled by its government. Germany did not understand that Britain would support France. Source E states that Germany used the crises in 1905 and 1911 to undermine the Anglo-French Entente Cordiale but the outcome was the opposite. The friendship between Britain and France was enhanced.'*

### L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE **AND** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [9–13]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disconfirm it. However, sources are used only at face value.

For example, *'On the other hand, Germany's policies in Morocco from 1905 to 1911 were not completely unjustified. Source A shows that Germany recognised Morocco as an independent country in 1905 and William II treated the Sultan respectfully. Germany regarded the Kaiser's visit as a success. Source B explains that Britain, not Germany, was responsible for the growing tensions between them, including the Morocco crisis after 1905. In Source C, Germany was seeking an area of influence in Morocco that was outside the control of France and Spain and which was needed by Germany for its resources.'*

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	13

L4 BY INTERPRETING / EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE **OR** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [14–16]

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

For example, *'The claim that Germany's policies in Morocco from 1905 to 1911 were completely unjustified is correct if we examine the sources critically. Although Source D is a British source and unlikely to be sympathetic to Germany because of the status of the writer – Lloyd George was British Prime Minister during crucial years of World War I – and memoirs should be treated with caution, the source is correct when it states that the treaty of Algeçiras awarded influence in Morocco to France. It is also correct that Germany resorted to gunboat diplomacy in 1911 and made a mistake about the effects of the crisis on Anglo-French relations. Source E can be mostly trusted as a recent secondary source although it is by a British writer. An evaluation of two of the German sources confirm this judgement. Source B is incorrect to claim that Britain was behind the anti-German feeling. The second of William II's handwritten notes reveals accurately his tendency to make violent statements about the likelihood of war. Source C demonstrates the feelings of German nationalists, wishing to cause trouble in Morocco. Although it intended to defend German policies, the effect is to show that Germany was in the wrong.'*

L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE **AND** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [17–21]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example, (L4 plus) *'...However, the sources can also be interpreted to show that Germany did have some justification. Source A is probably an accurate account of what happened during the Kaiser's visit to Morocco in 1905. Germany regarded France's special status in Morocco as unjustified. Source B was written when Germany believed that it was being encircled by Britain, France and Russia and there were war-scares in Britain which Germany rejected. The Kaiser's remark about the likelihood of war was not necessarily a serious political statement about Germany's intentions.'*

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	13

- L6 AS L5, PLUS **EITHER** (a) EXPLAINS WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE / SUPPORT IS BETTER / PREFERRED, **OR** (b) RECONCILES / EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED [22–25]

For (a), the argument must be that the evidence for challenging or supporting the claim is more justified. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but why some evidence is worse.

For example, *'Although there is evidence in the sources both to challenge and support the claim that Germany's policies in Morocco from 1905 to 1911 were completely unjustified, the more convincing judgement is that Germany was in the wrong. The Moroccan crises in 1905 and 1911 must be seen in the wider context of diplomacy. Britain and France settled their differences in north Africa after Fashoda. French control of Morocco was balanced by British control of Egypt. Germany, seeking a more important role in the world, tried to exploit the situation in Morocco by gaining influence there and in the hope that the Entente Cordiale would be weak. In Source A, the Kaiser intervened without regard to British and French reactions, showing his limits as a diplomat. The most revealing aspect of Source B is the brief comment by William II that showed he was willing to risk war. The source also puts Morocco in the wider context. Source C shows the dangerous ambitions of German nationalists while Source D indicates accurately how German government ministers mishandled the Agadir crisis. They were slow to see how serious it was. The conclusion that the Moroccan crises brought Britain and France closer together is accurate. Source E is a measured account and is probably reliable as an explanation of German failure.'*

**OR**

*'Although there is evidence in the sources to support the claim that Germany's policies in Morocco from 1905 to 1911 were completely unjustified, Germany's case should not be forgotten. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it seemed as if Britain and France were carving up the world, including north Africa, in their own interests. Technically, the Kaiser was correct in Source A to claim that Morocco was an independent country. Germany felt excluded. Source B reflects the unease in Germany that it was encircled. Its only serious ally was the comparatively weak Austria. Although Source D exaggerates Germany's relations with Britain and France, the seriousness of the Entente Cordiale between Britain and France was not obvious. Britain did not clarify its relations with France until World War I broke out.'*

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support / contradict) in order to improve it.

For example, *'An alternative explanation is that Germany's actions were more unjustified than those of Britain and France but that none of the governments deserves to escape criticism. Morocco was an example of a region where European countries were engaged in rivalry for reasons that were almost wholly exaggerated. Politicians were guilty of misjudgements. Germany could not succeed. Resistance by France would lead to war if Germany did not withdraw. Britain did not make its commitments to France clear. Europe risked a major war over a comparatively minor issue.'*

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	13

## Section B

### 2 Why were attempts to reform the ancien régime in France to 1789 unsuccessful?

The end point of this question is clear but the beginning date is more open. Candidates can focus on the reign of Louis XVI from 1774 but can equally begin in 1715 with the accession of Louis XV. Very few will deal with Louis XIV's reign with more than generalities and this period is not expected. Some reforms were implemented. For example, there were positive developments in foreign trade and agriculture was improved in some regions. But answers that discuss only the failure of reforms can merit any mark. In an autocratic system, reform depended on the willingness of kings to support change. Louis XV was idle and uninterested. Louis XVI was not as reactionary as he has often been portrayed but was too weak to push for reform. Both kings were unwilling to confront the forces of reaction. Candidates should not go beyond 1789 but can look at the initial stages of the revolution in 1789. Controllers General failed to improve the situation. These conservative forces were strong and pervaded society. The great majority of the nobility saw danger, not opportunity, in change. Feudal privilege meant the defence of the status quo. They opposed reforms to the taxation system. It is not true that they did not pay taxes but they benefited from an unfair fiscal system. The Church hierarchy was conservative. For most of the century, the middle classes were unable to push through their programmes of reform. The peasantry were mostly conservative, unwilling to embrace new methods of agriculture that might have improved their conditions. The political structure lacked the institutions that might have brought about reform. The Parlements were preoccupied with promoting their rights against the monarchy rather than in reform for its own sake. Events in the late 1780s, such as the convening of the Assembly of Notables and the Estates General, showed the lack of institutions that could bring about change. Government debt, especially caused by war, paralysed the efforts of reformers because very major changes were needed. It was irrelevant to concentrate on making minor amendments.

### 3 Did the Industrial Revolution do more to benefit or to harm the working classes by the end of the nineteenth century? (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The best answers will consider the alternatives of 'benefit' and 'harm' but not necessarily in a balanced way. A strong argument can be made for either. Candidates are asked to refer to at least two of Britain, France and Germany in their answers but references can be brief. The range of the discussion can be very wide and examiners will use their judgement when considering this. It can include social aspects, economic consequences and political effects. Among the social aspects may be housing and living conditions, leisure, family relationships and religion. Benefits might include higher standards of living by the end of the nineteenth century for many but not for all. Many of the working classes still had very low standards of living. There were benefits from social reforms affecting the hours and conditions of work and education. Leisure opportunities expanded by the end of the century. Religion became less important although non-conformist churches in Britain had more of an appeal. The Roman Catholic Church on the continent and the Anglican Church in Britain had less of an appeal in industrial areas. Germany was ahead of Britain and France in providing some public insurance schemes. Economic effects included the ability of a few to become wealthier, although very few became rich. Others whose economic standing depended on traditional trades and methods declined. Most working class men – but not women – had the franchise by 1900 but the extent to which this gave them political power varied. The French Third Republic was probably the most democratic. In Britain, the working classes still depended on the traditional Conservative and Liberal parties, dominated by the upper classes. The Labour Representation Committee was founded in 1900, to be followed after the period in the question by the Labour Party in 1906. The German political scene was dominated by conservative Prussians. Working class influence was limited. The question allows for – but does not require – a comparison of industrial and pre-industrial conditions. Some candidates might claim that pre-industrial societies were better for the working classes.

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>13</b>

**4 Assess the claim that Garibaldi was the greatest of the leaders who brought about Italian unification.**

The question involves a comparison: was Garibaldi the greatest leader? Garibaldi alone with no mention of any other leader(s) might take an answer to Band 4. Garibaldi and one other might deserve up to Band 2. Other leaders discussed might include Cavour and Mazzini, but Victor Emmanuel or Charles Albert might be mentioned. A good case can be made for Garibaldi. Although a heroic failure in 1848–49, he became an effective military figure when he led the 1,000 Red Shirts in the attack on Sicily in 1860 and went on to win Naples. This gave Italian unification a different and wider character than Cavour had envisaged. His willingness to surrender his gains to Victor Emmanuel prevented a potentially fatal split in the ranks of the nationalists. He failed to take Rome but did much to shape the unity of the peninsula. Cavour's more limited aims, to strengthen Piedmont as the leader of a united north, were achieved first by reorganising Piedmont and then by diplomacy, in winning the vital support of Napoleon III's France. His pragmatism was shown when he agreed to hand Nice and Savoy to France. First Lombardy, then the central states of Tuscany, Parma and Modena through somewhat dubious plebiscites, came under Piedmont's control. Although not enthusiastic about Garibaldi's southern expedition, Cavour handled the outcome well. By the time of his death in 1861, Italy was unified except for Venetia and Rome. Mazzini has often been described as the soul or spirit of Italian unification. While the priority of others was local or regional independence, he advocated the union of all Italy from an early stage. It might be claimed that his career was one of failure. The Carbonari, Young Italy and successive risings, culminating in 1848–49, failed to achieve their objectives. Yet he laid the foundations on which Victor Emmanuel and Cavour built. Garibaldi was inspired by him and they shared the hardships of the defence of Rome 1848–49, although Garibaldi's later career reflected more the ideas of Piedmont than Mazzini. Italy did not become a Mazzinian republic but a Piedmontese monarchy. Its democracy was more limited than Mazzini envisaged. Yet his claim to primacy is not invalid. Cavour and Garibaldi could not have succeeded without him and Italy might have emerged as a country of independent regions.

**5 Why did public opinion in major European countries give widespread support to imperial expansion in the late nineteenth century?**

The focus on public opinion means that other factors should be linked to this to deserve higher credit. However, it is valid to point out that other factors were important in 'New Imperialism'. Few are likely to disagree that public opinion was important although some excellent candidates might point out its limitations. The poorest in society were more concerned about issues that affected them directly and there is evidence that the middle classes were most enthusiastic about imperial expansion. However, politicians, including right-wing figures such as Bismarck and Disraeli, believed that imperialism was a popular issue in the ballot box. British writers such as Kipling had their equivalents on the continent. New mass circulation newspapers and magazines found stories about imperial adventures to be popular. Public opinion supported the 'civilising' aspect of imperialism. Individuals such as Rhodes (at least until the Jameson Raid), Livingstone, Stanley and Karl Peters became popular heroes. Public opinion joined in the support for imperial expansion as a measure of national greatness. This was used by Britain, France, Germany and Italy even when the gains were of little value. There was enthusiasm for military exploits as long as they were successful. Gordon's defeat and death in 1885 caused an outcry against Gladstone's government. (The Boer War was probably a turning point in enthusiasm for imperialism in Britain: rather later than the question specifies but acceptable if referred to.) Some of the public, but not all, benefited from imports of more exotic commodities. Some have argued the case for the benefits of employment in empires but few gained from this. Another case has been made out for the importance of surplus capital in New Imperialism. This has been discredited but might still be stated in some of the books that are studied. In any case, surplus capital was not an issue that would have affected public opinion widely. Examiners will look for examples to support arguments. In this question, the examples might well be largely from Europe rather than overseas.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9697	13

## 6 Why was Lenin a successful revolutionary leader in October 1917?

The focus of the question is clearly on October 1917 but the key issue needs to be put into context. No credit can be given to discussions of the later period unless a brief part of a conclusion. Examiners will distinguish between narrative that lacks ideas and a successful chronological approach that is based on issues. Very high credit should be given if candidates point out that Lenin's earlier career seemed more marked by failure than success. He did not predict the 1905 Revolution and returned to Russia too late to play a significant part. He was surprised when the February Revolution of 1917 broke out. Yet, his career prepared him for success in October 1917. Lenin split the Russian Social Democrats in 1903, preferring to work with a small group of determined Bolsheviks. He was a man of ideas, the editor of 'Pravda' and the writer of important books and pamphlets that spread his views. Although in exile for much of the period to 1917, he found it possible to maintain contacts with Bolsheviks in Russia. The events of 1917 transformed Lenin's fortunes. His return after the February Revolution showed that he was aware of the main issues and that he could embody programmes in popular slogans such as 'Peace, Land and Bread' and 'All Power to the Soviets'. Candidates may explain why these issues were important. Although he was a dedicated revolutionary, Lenin was also adaptable. He realised the importance of the rural workers, unlike the main tenets of Marxist teaching. Lenin survived the crisis of the July Days and was one of the few to see the opportunity in October to seize power. Although the October Revolution was portrayed later as a popular rising, it was actually the work of Lenin's small minority. The question allows candidates to discuss other factors and it can be argued that Lenin's success was made possible by external issues such as the effects of the war and the failure of Kerensky's Provisional Government. However, less credit will be given when the links to the key issue are implicit rather than explicit.

## 7 How far did Stalin continue Lenin's policies in the USSR to 1939?

1939 is mentioned because it is the end of the topic and the syllabus. Examiners will look for a reasonable balance when awarding Band 1. A split of 60:40 can merit any mark band and 70:30 might be acceptable if the minority aspect is explained very well. Band 5 will need an acceptable knowledge of either Lenin or Stalin. Candidates might either tackle the question sequentially, first Lenin and then Stalin, or issue by issue. The second approach is more likely to bring very high marks because it will be easier to make the necessary links. However, sequential answers that keep making comparisons should not be debarred from the highest bands. Stalin claimed to be Lenin's heir although he suppressed Lenin's suspicions of him. Stalin departed from Lenin's economic policies, replacing the NEP with state control of all aspects of the economy, especially through the Five Year Plans (1928–32, 1933–37 and 1938–42). However, Lenin was fundamentally Marxist in his economic thinking. Both implemented a one-party state although Stalin was more ruthless, purging major figures within the Bolsheviks such as Kamenev, Zinoviev and especially Trotsky. The purges of the 1930s went further to include anyone who was suspected of being 'an enemy of the people'. Lenin had tolerated different opinions within the Bolshevik hierarchy as long as his view prevailed ultimately. Stalin removed anyone who did not conform and many who did. Lenin's personal leadership was followed by Stalin's pre-eminence. Both used propaganda but Stalin did so to a greater extent. Use of the secret police, special courts and special prisons or gulags was a common factor but was more extensive under Stalin. The question mentions 'policies in the USSR'. This guides candidates to focus on domestic issues but discussions of foreign policy should not be ignored. By 1939, there were many common features with both leaders mostly isolating Russia from the rest of the world, although Stalin gave some support to the Republicans in the Spanish civil war.

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>13</b>

## **8 Which affected Europe more by 1914, Marxism or Liberalism?**

The question is cross-thematic, with candidates having to draw on their knowledge and understanding of more than one topic. 1914 is the specified end-point although answers can refer to the 1917 revolutions in Russia briefly in conclusions. The areas of relevance are defined in the question but the range of discussions can vary. Examiners can be flexible about balance. A split of 70:30 either way can merit any mark band. Band 5 will still need an adequate knowledge of one of the specified issues. The question will probably be approached sequentially. This will be acceptable for any band as long as there is a strong introduction or conclusion that explains their relative importance. Marxism developed from the middle of the nineteenth century. Its appeal and effects were patchy. Most affected were France and Germany. Less affected was Britain (and the USA). Candidates might have studied pre-revolutionary Russia and can examine its impact there. In France, there was political support from some of the working class and Marxism played a role in the revolution of 1870–71, especially in the Commune. Germany saw some Marxist groups develop, which Bismarck and other conservatives believed dangerous, but they had little effect by 1914. Marxists were a minority, albeit active, in Russia. Working class organisations in Britain, including the incipient Labour movement, had other roots. Marxists played a minor role. The case for Liberalism might be made on the basis that many western countries in 1914 had characteristics that might be seen as Liberal. In the three western countries that are most often studied (and candidates are not required to show knowledge of others), Britain, France and Germany had wide franchises and can be viewed as democratic. This was in contrast to Russia. Liberalism implied freedom of speech, rule by established laws, religious toleration and other popular rights. The extent to which these were enjoyed in the three western countries can be assessed but it was to a greater extent than in Russia, where Liberalism hardly penetrated beyond a small minority by 1914.