

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2014 series

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 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 October/November 2014 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
1	21–25	<i>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.</i>
2	18–20	<i>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.</i>
3	16–17	<i>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.</i>
4	14–15	<i>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.</i>
5	11–13	<i>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.</i>
6	8–10	<i>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.</i>
7	0–7	<i>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 making at least a few valid points.</i>

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9697	13

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

- 1 'Germany was fully justified in increasing its sea power before World War I.' 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	Speech by the minister in charge of the British navy.	There is a clear contrast between Britain's need for a large navy and Germany's position.	Y – Britain's navy was the basis of its power. It did not have a strong army to fight effectively on land. Y – It reflects accurately the international tensions between Britain and Germany in 1912. N – Britain still maintained a considerable superiority at sea.	Y – B confirms Churchill's concerns about a growing threat from the German navy. Y – E supports the view that German naval policies disturbed the balance of power. N – C contradicts the view that German expansion at sea threatened peace and Britain in particular. Germany's ambitions were modest and justified. N – D defends German naval plans as necessary to overcome Germany's considerable weaknesses at sea.	Responses can expand on the contrast between the military conditions of Britain and Germany and link these to political and strategic interests. Answers might query whether Germany saw an enlarged navy as a luxury in view of its growing empire and why Britain's stance might have appeared unreasonable.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9697	13

B	British memorandum about rival naval strengths.	The figures show that Germany was increasing its navy at a faster rate than Britain. The German fleet would potentially be larger than Britain's.	Y – The figures can probably be accepted as accurate. Y – The memorandum reflects British concerns about the naval race. N – It is very one-sided. It does not give the size of the British fleet in 1898 as a comparison.	Y – A has the same view of the danger to Britain from the growing German navy. Y – E shows that the naval race, begun by Germany, destabilised the international situation. N – C and D disagree about a threat from Germany.	Responses are not expected to provide a close analysis of the figures but might come to some broad conclusions.
C	Post-war memoirs of a leading German admiral.	Germany's naval ambitions were reasonable, unlike Britain's. They were also more peaceful and necessary for Germany's defence.	Y – The source indicates German inferiority at sea. N – It minimises the threat from Germany. N – Germany did wish to become a world power.	Y – D agrees that British reactions were unreasonable. N – A, B and E take a contrary view of responsibility, and effects of, the naval race.	Did Germany's growing overseas trade and colonies necessitate a much larger navy? N – This did not in itself lead to a need for battleships etc. especially when based near the North Sea. Y/N – Why did Germany need a large navy for defence when its largest potential enemies were France and Russia?

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9697	13

D	Post-war memoirs of the Kaiser.	Germany's navy was much weaker than Britain's and its strengthening was vital.	Y – Germany did see a powerful navy as necessary for the defence of trade. Y – There were weaknesses in the Baltic. Germany feared a larger Russian navy in that region. N – There is no reference to the effects of German policies on the international situation, especially British interests.	Y – A agrees that Germany needed a larger navy. N – A, B and E see German naval policies as unjustified.	Is there a valid case that Germany needed better defences in the Baltic against a growing Russian navy?
E	Item from the BBC website.	The German naval building programme disturbed the balance of power. It led to the growth of rival alliances because Britain needed allies to counteract the German threat.	Y – The factual basis of the source is accurate. Germany's growing navy disturbed the balance of power. N – While the BBC is generally held to give fair coverage, it poses problems as an internet site.	Y – A and B agree that Germany's naval policy was stabilising. N – War did become more likely but it is debatable whether the people of all the major countries believed that it was inevitable, even less welcome.	The extent of a change of policy when William took power from Bismarck can be explored.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	969

1 Source-Based Question

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES

These answers write generally about 1914 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 the hypothesis but will describe events generally. Include answers which use information from the sources to provide a summary of the views expressed, rather than for testing the hypothesis.

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: *‘The sources contradict the claim that Germany was fully justified in increasing its sea power before World War I. Source A states that a large navy was not essential to Germany, unlike Britain. Germany was already a great power, even without a navy. Source B comments that Germany was not forced by the size of the British navy to increase the number of its warships. The British government uses statistics to back the argument. Source E argues that the increase in the German navy disturbed the balance of power and was therefore not justified.’*

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, some sources argue that Germany was fully justified in increasing its sea power before World War I. Source C states that Germany was forced to increase its navy in order to defend itself. Britain refused to respect Germany’s position as a strong power. Germany required an effective navy to protect its trade and overseas commitments. Source D justifies Germany’s naval building programme because its sea defences were weak and Germany never aimed to be the equal of Britain at sea.’*

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 was fully justified in increasing its sea power before World War I can be supported if sources are evaluated. At face value, Sources C and D are unreliable because the provenance of both is German and they are taken from memoirs. Such memoirs usually justify the writers and therefore must be treated with caution as historical evidence. But this does not necessarily mean that they should automatically be rejected as valueless. Source C makes the point that Germany’s need for a stronger navy arose from its new role as a world power. It had to defend its overseas trade, important to an industrial country. It also had colonies in Africa and Asia. Source D makes the valid point that, taken as a whole, the German navy was not strong. The British navy was superior and contextual knowledge indicates that Britain and Germany were not the only countries to increase their navies at that time. Russia also strengthened its fleet in the Baltic and this was seen as a real danger by Germany.’*

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	969

L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS

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) *'The sources can be interpreted to show that Germany was not justified in increasing its sea power before World War I. Source A is a speech by a leading British politician and must be treated carefully. It makes a valid point that a powerful navy was more important to Britain than Germany. Germany was essentially a land power while Britain was a sea power. The figures in Source B can be accepted as fairly accurate and show that there were real fears that Britain would be overtaken by Germany at sea. Source B focuses on the naval race but it can be added that Britain had no plans for a major increase in its land forces where Germany was strong. This confirms the claim in Source E that German policy disturbed the balance of power.'*

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 to challenge and support the claim that Germany was fully justified in increasing its sea power before World War I, the more convincing judgement is that Germany was not justified. The most important source in coming to this conclusion is E. It is the most objective of the extracts and it also puts the naval race in the context of diplomacy before the world war. The other sources are useful in providing views of British and German opinion.'*

OR

'Although there is evidence in the sources to challenge and support the claim that Germany was fully justified in increasing its sea power before World War I, the overall judgement must be inconclusive. The sources fall into two groups. Sources A, B and E challenge the hypothesis while Sources C and D support it. The challenging sources are correct in claiming that Britain believed its naval primacy was vital to its interests. The supporting group show that Germany believed this was an unreasonable attitude. The combination of support and challenge for the hypothesis explains why the problem became insoluble before World War I. It was a clash between an established power and a new but growing country, each of which was backed by allies, neither being willing to modify its naval policies sufficiently to reach an agreement.'

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 the hypothesis should be modified to state that Britain and Germany were equally responsible for the naval race before World War I. The two groups of sources show that Britain and Germany each believed that it had vital interests at sea. In view of Britain's naval supremacy, which was maintained during the war, it is possible to argue that it exaggerated the danger from Germany. The balancing case is that William II was unwise to abandon Bismarck's policy of ignoring sea power in favour of a land strategy.'*

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	969

Section B

- 2 **‘The collapse of the French ancien régime in 1789 was sudden and unexpected.’ How far do you agree with this judgement?**

The best answers are likely to consider alternative judgements and to make their conclusions clear. In favour of the claim, it might be argued that although France’s condition in 1789 was serious, problems had been apparent for many years and the regime had survived. There were few outright revolutionaries in 1789. Most who were dissatisfied sought reform, not radical change. The meeting of the Estates General was not seen, in itself, as a last resort with revolution as the only alternative. All social groups welcomed it as a solution to their problems.

The first and major crisis over voting was not predicted. Against the claim, it might be argued that long-term problems were so serious that they were insoluble and the revolution was not unexpected by later historians. The state was deeply in debt. Successive attempts by controllers-general to improve the finances had failed, partly because the debts were so great and partly because reforms were opposed by entrenched groups. King Louis XVI lacked the will to push through changes. The Parlements were resistant. The Assembly of Notables failed. Poor harvests in the late 1780s affected the peasantry and urban lower orders worst. Their demands were more social and economic than political.

In 1789, events moved quickly. Discussion of the cahiers was bogged down in the debate over voting. Louis’ reaction worsened the problems. The Third Estate declared itself as the National Assembly. The attack on the Bastille, while it can be exaggerated, was an ominous development towards disorder. The Declaration of the Rights of Man and statements about the end of feudalism showed that France was in a revolution. The march to Versailles and the King’s forced return to Paris were proof of this. On the other hand, it can be argued that long-term factors were creating a revolutionary situation before 1789. Answers might assess the importance of the enlightened thinkers, but this discussion must be linked to the question to be credited.

- 3 **How far do you agree that the most important result of the Industrial Revolution was the growth of the middle classes?** (You should refer to developments in **at least two** of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

To achieve the highest levels it is important that responses assess the results of the Industrial Revolution. Economies were transformed from a primary dependence on land and associated forms of economic practice to an industrial base. Factories became more important than small, often cottage, industries. Gradually, land-based groups lost out to those that made a living from industry. Among these were the middle classes. Their money gave them greater importance. They not only dominated economies but also gained political influence.

Responses might prefer to note the effects on the lower orders. They had little economic power but were becoming more important politically by the end of the nineteenth century. Living and working in towns allowed them to organise themselves and loosen the control of the traditional classes. Industrially-based political philosophies emerged, especially Socialism and Marxism. The Industrial Revolution had wider political and economic effects. It is not a coincidence that the three major European states of Britain, Germany and France were the most industrialised. New centres of population grew up, often towns that depended almost wholly on industry. Communications were transformed. These did not have only economic consequences but also social results. Social mobility followed as well as leisure opportunities for some. Other social consequences included the spread of education and a rise in real income for many. Food became cheaper, as did clothes. Industrialised countries gave governments more money for weapons and expansion overseas.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	969

4 'More a victory for Prussian expansionism than for German nationalism.' Assess judgement of German unification under Bismarck.

It is likely that most answers will focus on Bismarck, and this question could be addressed by a discussion of whether he was more a champion of Prussian interests or a German nationalist from 1862 to 1871. Some responses might see the issues as complete alternatives and discuss only one, but the most successful are likely to consider both alternatives and come to a clear conclusion.

On the one hand, a strong case can be made for Bismarck as a champion of Prussia. His priority in 1862 as Minister-President was to push through the army reforms that would strengthen the monarchy and weaken the Liberals. He was very different from the Liberals in his views of a united Germany – and different from those who had fought for the cause in 1848. He also differed in his views of the internal policies of Prussia. He was involved in successive crises but depended on the co-operation and weakness of others to achieve his aims. Unification went through at least three stages: the alliance with Austria over the Schleswig-Holstein question, the ousting of Austria and the formation of the North German Confederation, and the final defeat of France. It is difficult to see that anybody could have envisaged this as a coherent aim in 1862. Each of these stages essentially strengthened Prussia. Responses may refer to the constitution of the new Germany in 1871. This embedded Prussian power in the Bundesrat; the monarchy was safeguarded and Bismarck's authority was unquestioned.

On the other hand, it can be argued that Bismarck had a long-term plan. He certainly used German sentiment to win support for his policies in the three major stages. There is an argument that Bismarck was pushed further than he originally intended and would have been satisfied with the largely Protestant North German Confederation (1867). This followed the war with Austria that excluded it from German affairs. He could not have predicted the emergence of the issue of the Spanish throne or the reactions of France, although he probably envisaged a future struggle with France.

5 'Unplanned expansion.' How far do you agree with this description of 'New Imperialism' in the late nineteenth century?

The case for the claim in the question might refer to the lack of specific aims in 'New Imperialism'. There was sometimes confusion. For example, Gordon led a badly organised expedition against the Mahdi. Gladstone, the British Prime Minister, ordered a withdrawal but Gordon remained in Khartoum to die. The outcome was Kitchener's more successful speculation. Disraeli first believed that colonies were not worthwhile but changed his mind, partly because of public pressure and partly to emulate Germany when William I declared himself Kaiser / Emperor. Public opinion changed the mind of Bismarck who was initially cool about the value of imperial expansion for Germany. European governments sometimes had to back their nationals whose actions far away were uncontrolled. Fashoda might be cited as an example, as could the Jameson Raid and Rhodes's exploits, which could not be disowned. Missionary activities often depended on domestic funding but were not highly organised.

On the other hand, imperialism was a matter of national policy that engaged governments. William II of Germany embarked on a deliberate policy of Weltpolitik or world power. France deliberately embraced imperialism as a national issue to protect its international status. Governments were particularly involved in Asia, partly because of the distances involved and partly because, within the Asian mainland, Europeans had to deal with local powers who were able to defend their interests better. Economic motives were important and involved governments as well as major trading groups and investors in Europe.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	969

6 Why was World War I so damaging to the Tsarist regime in Russia?

The longer term causes of the fall of Nicholas II's regime, perhaps from 1905–06, can be relevant but should be linked to the period from 1914. On the other hand, it would be possible to focus narrowly on the wartime years and present a very strong argument. In spite of his problems, Nicholas II was fairly popular in 1914 and he seemed to be in control of Russia. However, he wasted the opportunities offered after the 1905 revolution to widen support for his regime. His autocracy meant that he was blamed mostly for the difficulties of his situation. He was blindly reactionary and became the focus of opposition.

While the declaration of war was supported, sentiments soon changed with defeat and casualties. About half of the 15 million Russian soldiers were either killed, wounded or captured. The costs of the war were enormous, increasing inflation. The rise in prices was paralleled by a shortage of food. Communications broke down. The railways could not carry enough supplies to the war fronts or enough food to towns. Almost everybody in Russia was affected.

The war had political repercussions. Nicholas II took personal command of the armies in 1915. This did nothing to improve the military situation. It was disastrous politically. He left a vacuum that Alexandra, the Tsarina, and Rasputin could not fill. There were constant changes of ministers. It became apparent that the Tsar was losing the support of his important traditional allies at court. Most ominously, the discontent in different levels of the army was apparent.

However, the breakdown of the system in February 1917 was unexpected. Lenin later claimed the inevitability of revolution and the downfall of tsarism but, at the time, he thought that a revolution would take many years. The outbreak was disorganised, beginning with uncoordinated protests by women and factory workers. Support for the regime by soldiers soon evaporated. This now gave the radicals the opportunity to act.

7 Why was there little opposition to Hitler in Germany by 1939?

Possibly the most likely source of effective opposition was from the communists, an active and influential group until the Nazis gained power. However, Stalin refused to support any idea of active opposition by them. His priority was 'socialism in one country'. There was some opposition from clerics and young people, including the Edelweiss Pirates who reacted against the Hitler Youth. As institutions, the Churches conformed. Hitler quickly agreed a Concordat (1933) with the Papacy which was mostly sustained. Youth opposition was limited by social circumstances. It lacked a coherent programme and young men were increasingly conscripted to the army.

It can be argued that Hitler's policies were mostly popular. He attacked groups that were already unpopular in Germany such as Jews, other racial minorities and homosexuals. His forceful personality and policies were a contrast to the failures of those who led the Weimar Republic after Stresemann's death. He kept on good terms with the army and important economic interests. The labouring classes were strictly controlled but more by the use of the carrot than the stick.

Another problem for opponents was the all-embracing police system. Terror was widespread. It was complemented by propaganda. Hitler seemed to fulfil his promises and respond to the grievances of Germans caused by the Versailles settlement. Candidates might refer to the assassination plots headed by soldiers but the most famous with Stauffenberg was in 1944, after the question. There were some other plots but after 1939.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	969

8 How similar were the 1848 revolutions in Italy and Germany to the French Revolution of 1789?

The key issue is the comparison of the stated revolutions. 'How similar?' implies differences: contrasts as well as comparisons. Candidates can consider causes, courses and outcomes. Candidates are very likely to discuss each region in turn. This will be acceptable for any mark as long as they make comparative comments. For France, they can explain developments to about 1793 and further as long as they provide concise arguments. The three revolutions represented resistance to burdensome autocracies. There were demands for constitutions. The role of Austria was somewhat different. In Italy and Germany it was the dominating and reactionary external power. It was also the enemy of the revolution in France but was not a cause of the events of 1789. Attitudes to unification were different. It might be argued that regionalism was a stronger force in Italy and Germany. France was already united and the diverse forces did not seriously threaten the unity of the French state. The outcomes were different. In the short term, the French revolutionaries achieved their aims. They did not in Italy and Germany.