

**UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**  
GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper**  
**for the guidance of teachers**

**9697 HISTORY**

**9697/12**

Paper 12, 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.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 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 – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>12</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.

In bands of 3 marks, examiners will normally award the middle mark, moderating it up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer. In bands of 2 marks, examiners should award the lower mark if an answer just deserves the band and the higher mark if the answer clearly deserves the 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 – May/June 2010	9697	12

### SOURCE-BASED QUESTION: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

**'Germany wanted Austria to go to war with Serbia in 1914.' 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	Telegram from an important German official to an ambassador reporting a personal telegram from the Kaiser to the Austrian Emperor. (The 'Blank Cheque' to Austria.)	The Kaiser is aware of danger. He cannot interfere but promises to support Austria. This might possibly be seen as a mixed message.	Y – The Kaiser gives Austria Germany's full support. He fully realises the danger to Austria. Y – Bethmann-Hollweg was an important German politician. N – Germany cannot interfere. (But this is not as significant an issue.)	Y – The German sympathy for Austria is confirmed by all other sources. Y – E repeats the point about Russia's role. Y – B confirms German support for Austria. N – B sees Austria as playing an independent role. N – C thinks that Germany's less moderate attitude pressed Austria.	Y – Germany's 'Blank Cheque' is seen by most historians to have been an important reason for Austria's tough line with Serbia. It was also aggressive in its purpose. Y – The Kaiser's claim that he could not interfere can be contradicted in many ways in 1914 and before.
B	Official record of an Austrian ministerial council meeting.	A dialogue between two ministers of different opinions. Berchtold is more hard-line than the cautious Tisza.	Y – Tisza stated that Germany was urging Austria to act. N – Berchtold does not see Germany as the primary agent but as giving Austria support. Tisza states, with Berchtold's agreement, that Austria should decide policy itself.	Y – A, on face value, says that Austria has the initiative. Y – D, although supported by Germany, sees the initiative with Austria. N – C sees Germany in the driving seat, with an implied threat if Austria does not pursue warlike policies. N – E claims that Germany was trying to reconcile Austria and Russia and that Germany's attitude to Serbia was friendly.	Y – The alliance between Germany and Austria was close with Germany as the dominant partner.  N – Austria did have a policy to weaken Serbia substantially, independently of German policy.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>12</b>

C	Message from a French Ambassador to his Ministry.	Germany wishes to take strong action. Austria is also determined in contrast to its previous weakness.	Y – Cambon blames William II for taking the lead. He reports a Russian diplomat's view that Germany wanted war. Austria is weaker and less united. Y – The source probably conveys accurately the mood in Berlin. N – The writer is anti-German and might wish to exaggerate the belligerence of Germany.	Y – A promises full, if undefined support, to Austria, increasing the danger of war. Y – C believes Germany to be determined to push Austria into action. N – B states that Austria is the prime mover in determining its policies. N – D states that Germany had no prior knowledge of Austria's ultimatum. N – E states that Russia is more responsible than Germany or Austria for the crisis.	Y – There were important groups in Germany that favoured war. Y – Austrian power was diminishing. Germany saw it as necessary to play a strong part in persuading Austria to take action. N – Austria was unwilling to modify its demands against Serbia. N – There was a long history of Austro-Serbian animosity. Y/N – The German reaction to the Sarajevo assassination is described accurately but most European powers did believe it caused a major crisis. There is other evidence for and against the claim that William II was belligerent at this time.
D	Message from a German Ambassador to a Russian Minister.	Germany denies fore-knowledge of the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia. Germany wishes for the quarrel between Austria and Serbia to be localised.	N – Germany had no knowledge of the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia or influence over Austria. Germany favours a localised conflict.	Y – A, B, C and E make no mention of Germany's influence on the Austrian ultimatum. Y – A, B, and E agree that Germany was Austria's ally. Y – E claims that Russia is more responsible. N – Both speakers in B agree on the importance of Germany's influence over Austria. N – C: Germany wants war and believes Austria might be weak.	Y – Germany did influence Austria to take action after the Sarajevo assassination. Y – The claim that Germany had no knowledge of Austria's ultimatum is untrue. Y – Germany had already issued the 'blank cheque'. Germany also had wider war plans, for example the Schlieffen Plan. N – Germany did want a localised, not European world war. This might exclude Germany's military participation. N – Russia had traditional ties to Serbia based on race, religion and anti-Austrian feeling. This was not in Germany's control.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>12</b>

E	Message from a Serbian Ambassador to his Ministry.	Germany blames Russia for the war. Germany had tried to negotiate peace and moderate Austria's policies.	Y – The source probably does represent accurately the discussion between Yovanovitch. It also conveys Germany's fears of Russia's involvement. N – Germany's attitude to Serbia is misrepresented. Russian policy was not completely responsible for the tensions.	Y – At face value, Germany does not press Austria to go to war but only promises unspecified, if full, support. Y – Although an ally of Austria, Germany had no prior knowledge of the ultimatum to Serbia. N – B agrees that Germany was trying to persuade Austria to take stronger action. N – Germany is pressing Austria.	Y – Although Germany did try to persuade Russia not to intervene, its alliance with Austria was to be more important. N – Russia did give full support to Serbia, a factor in Serbian policy. N – Russian mobilisation was ultimately decisive. N – The claim that Austria would have been content with some concessions from Serbia underestimates the views of most Austrian politicians.
---	--	--	---	---	--

**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 – May/June 2010	9697	12

## SECTION A: THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR I, 1870– 1914

### GERMANY AND AUSTRIA IN 1914

#### 1 Source-Based Question

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

These answers write generally about the causes of World War I but will ignore the key issues in the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss '*Germany wanted Austria to go to war with Serbia in 1914.*' but might make general points about the causes of the war. Included in this level are 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 wanted Austria to go to war with Serbia in 1914 as is shown in Sources A, B and C and partly in Source E. Although William II states in Source A that he could not interfere in the quarrel between Austria and Serbia, he still gives the Austrian Emperor his personal guarantee of German support, which is based both on treaty obligations and on the traditional links between the two countries. Source B reports how Austria had been given complete support from Germany. The source mentions 'unconditional support' twice. Germany had urged Austria to act immediately against Serbia and a delay by Austria might lose it Germany's support in the future. Source C explains that Germany did not take a moderate stance and was suspicious of any moderation that Austria might show. Source E indicates that Germany wishes to bring about a settlement between Austria and Russia and implicitly believes that Germany was satisfied that Austria was seeking limited concessions from Serbia.*'

##### 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, Source D claims that Germany had no knowledge of the harsh terms in Austria's ultimatum to Serbia and denies that Germany's attitude was threatening. Source E blames Russia for the increased international tension and states that Germany's attitude to Serbia was friendly. Therefore Germany did not want Austria to attack Serbia.*'

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	12

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 wanted Austria to go to war with Serbia in 1914 can be proved by using Sources A, B and C. Source A can be relied on as evidence of German policies because Bethmann-Hollweg was a leading German politician who influenced, and was well-acquainted with, Germany's attitude to the dispute between Austria and Serbia. We also know that the 'Blank Cheque' was a major reason why Austria was so confident in imposing such harsh terms on Serbia. Source B as an official record probably does state correctly the major discussion at the Austrian ministerial meeting. It is particularly useful because it includes different Austrian views, those of men such as Berchtold, who wanted to take such a hard line, and Tisza's misgivings. Berchtold's opinion included the point that Germany had assured Austria of its support but added that Germany might withdraw this support if Austria hesitated. In some ways, Source C should be regarded with caution because it represents a message from a French ambassador to his Foreign Ministry. France was particularly hostile to Germany. However, the statements in the extract are probably true. Austria did refuse to modify its demands and the description of opinion in Germany, including William II, other members of the government and the press is accurate. We should note particularly the way in which Germany is encouraging Austria to take vigorous action.'*

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 contradict the claim that Germany wanted Austria to go to war with Serbia in 1914. In Source D, Yovanovitch's report to his Prime Minister cannot be accepted at face value because his government was suspicious of Germany and he was not objective. However, he probably reported the comments of the German official accurately. It is also true that Russian mobilisation was a major problem for Germany and it was to be an important reason for the declaration of war.'*

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	12

- 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 wanted Austria to go to war with Serbia in 1914, the more convincing judgement is that the claim is true. The Blank Cheque, which is the basis of Source A, was an unnecessary guarantee to Austria although Germany was its ally. Austrian confidence in Germany's support is fully apparent in Source B. This was used as a strong argument to overcome the doubts of men such as Tisza. Berchtold uses the decisive argument that, if Austria did not act decisively now, Germany might lose confidence in its ally. We should also note that Germany's support was unconditional, that is Germany would support any action by Austria. Although Source C might not be objective, being written by a French diplomat, it does represent accurately Germany's attitude. The extreme support for Austria was apparent in many quarters, from the Kaiser to the press. This extract supports the claims in Sources A and B that Germany did not want to persuade Austria to take a moderate line.'*

Or, *'Although there is evidence in the sources both to challenge and support the claim that Germany wanted Austria to go to war with Serbia in 1914, the more convincing case supports the claim. However, it must be remembered that the problem was not created by Germany but was the result of tensions between Austria and Serbia. These were caused both by long-term reasons and by the short-term issue of the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo. Source D is correct when it claims that Austria's initial reaction to the assassination was not due to German pressure and that Germans generally believed that Austria was justified in its grievance. Although Source E is written by a Serbian diplomat who would be anti-Austrian, anti-German and pro-Russian, the extract can be used to justify the claim that Germany wished to avoid hostility between Austria and Russia.'*

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 made a mistake by misjudging the effects of its relations with Austria. Germany went further than was necessary in preserving its alliance with Austria. Although there is plenty of evidence in the sources that Germany wanted Austria to take a tough line, they do not specifically state that Germany wanted Austria to unleash a war. William II claimed later that he did not realise that the crisis would result in a war. We must also remember that there were some in Germany who wanted to take a more moderate line and there were also Austrians, such as Tisza, who hesitated. The role of Russia, which is mentioned in Source E, was to be crucial because it related both to Austria and to Germany. It is possible to argue that Russian mobilisation was the key factor in the declaration of war and that Germany envisaged a minor conflict in the Balkans.'*



Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	12

## Section B

### 2 How far was France a police state under Napoleon Bonaparte from 1799 to 1814?

The key issue is in the phrase 'police state'. The question asks 'How far..?' and candidates should examine both the extent and limits of the claim. However, examiners will not expect balanced answers. The French were completely free under Napoleon but many candidates might judge that France was indeed a police state and therefore devote most of their time to this argument. An uncritical acceptance of this view might be worth up to Band 2 (and Band 1 might be achieved by excellent discussions) but normally answers in the highest band might be expected to consider both sides. Napoleon seized power in 1799, reduced the other Consuls to impotence and then declared himself Emperor in 1804. Although these changes were approved by plebiscites, and were genuinely supported by most French people, they represented authoritarian rule and the results of the plebiscites were rigged to produce even larger majorities in favour. Fouché headed the Ministry of Police. Letters of arrest very similar to the Bourbons' *lettres de cachet* were used. Opponents were detained. The press was heavily censored and the state itself engaged in widespread propaganda. Napoleon's governments under the Consulate and Empire gave him considerable power over central and local administration. The Codes might have guaranteed some freedoms but they were also a device to bring order and obedience to France. The Concordat with the Papacy (1801) recognised the need to conciliate the Roman Catholic Church and it also allowed some toleration to Protestants but its justification to Napoleon was political rather than moral. On the other hand, it can be argued that police action was not indiscriminate. Many French people found conditions improving. There is no need to compare Napoleon's rule with other revolutionary regimes (or other police states) but brief comparisons can be given credit.

### 3 How far do you agree that the Industrial Revolution was a disaster for the lower classes? (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is the effect of the Industrial Revolution on the lower classes. The question is not about the causes of the Industrial Revolution except that candidates can compare conditions that developed with those that the lower orders endured before the changes; this will make preconditions relevant. Most candidates are likely to agree with the question, making references to poor working conditions, slum housing, an absence of education and social welfare. However, this approach alone will probably lead to a ceiling of Band 2. Answers in the highest Band will normally require some awareness of alternative explanations. The living and working conditions of the lower classes before the Industrial Revolution were usually wretched. Some were forced to move from the countryside but many voluntarily sought employment in the new industries. Work was more reliable in urban areas, freer from the uncertainties of famine and harsh terms of tenure. During the Industrial Revolution, there were some (limited) moves to better social welfare and education. Governments were forced to respond (again in a limited way) to the demands of the industrial lower classes. Standards of living probably increased. Social mobility increased for a few. Candidates are asked to refer to developments in at least two specified countries. However, examiners will use their judgement about the detail and balance in these references. As always, the priority will be the quality of the argument. There might be long descriptions of the course of the Industrial Revolution but these need to be linked to the key issue if they are to be given credit. Some candidates might argue that other classes (especially the middle classes) gained more. This will be a worthwhile point to make but it should not lead to unbalanced answers that include much more about these other classes.

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>12</b>

**4 Examine the most important problems that faced Bismarck in unifying Germany during the period from 1862 to 1871.**

The key issue is the most important problems facing Bismarck from 1862 to 1871 in unifying Germany. Candidates might take either of two approaches. Their answers might be thematic, for example, political, diplomatic, military or economic. Alternatively, they might consider the problems of the successive stages: the domination of Austria and the establishment of the North German Confederation, the dominance of Prussia over the other states, usually called the southern states, and then the final conflict with France. Examiners will distinguish between chronological answers that make sound points en route and those that tell a story without seeming to show what it means in terms of the key issue. Either approach can merit the highest mark if well executed. However, both might result in weak answers. Most candidates might focus on the diplomatic: the ways in which Bismarck outwitted Austria, first by using its co-operation to advance Prussian power in the Danish/Schleswig-Holstein question, then the isolation of Austria largely through better relations with France (Napoleon III hoped for territorial gains) and Russia (Bismarck ensured that Prussia backed Russia in the Polish rising). By 1870, France was isolated and made to seem the aggressor over the Spanish succession. Reference might be made to the Ems Telegram. The military factor might be discussed. Although candidates might assert the superiority of the Prussian army, especially with the reforms of Moltke, Prussia's victory against both Austria and France was not assured. William I was sometimes nervous about Bismarck's policies and he also faced difficulties with the Liberals. Bismarck pushed through the necessary budget in the face of Liberal opposition. From 1866, some of the southern states were unenthusiastic about Prussia's dominance and saw French protection as a better alternative.

**5 Which was the more important reason for the 'New Imperialism' of the later nineteenth century: trade or power?**

The key issue is the most important reason for 'New Imperialism'. The question offers two factors: trade and power. Other explanations should be linked to the stated factors if they are to be given credit. Candidates can spend more time on their preferred explanation but should provide a reasonable balance to gain Bands 1 or 2. This might be 60:40 but 70:30 in a well-argued answer might qualify for any Band. Band 5 will require a basic knowledge and understanding of one factor. Bands 1 and 2 will also need appropriate supporting knowledge in the form of examples. The scope of imperial expansion was large and the regions involved were geographically vast; examiners will not expect a large number of geographical references. As for trade, it has been argued that there was surplus capital in Europe and the new colonies represented opportunities for investment and profit. However, candidates might argue that most investment went to other regions, such as the Americas, the older colonies and parts of Europe. Raw materials were needed for industries. Some might claim that the new colonies represented markets for European countries. However, it is difficult to see that this aim was fulfilled; the new colonies were generally poor. China was an exception (a part of New Imperialism although not a colony). India was an important market for Britain but an older colony. Power was both aggressive and defensive. Colonies represented world power. Many of the poorer classes supported this although some politicians such as Bismarck and Disraeli were initially cautious. The desire for power soon gave rise to international power struggles. This might have been particularly true of Germany, France and Italy. Leopold II of Belgium saw the Congo in terms of personal power. Reference might be made to other individuals such as Rhodes and Karl Peters.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	12

## 6 Why did the Bolsheviks replace the Provisional Government in Russia in 1917?

The key issue is the contrasting success of the Bolsheviks and the Provisional Government in 1917. The focus of answers should be on that year and it will be irrelevant to discuss earlier developments unless they are linked to the key issue. The question asks 'Why..?' and the answers in the two highest bands can be expected to be mostly analytical or explanatory. However, examiners would not undervalue answers that use description to underline explanation. It is reasonable to expect a fair balance in the discussions of the Bolsheviks and the Provisional Government. A split of 60:40 either way can merit any band. A 70:30 split might normally lead to the award of one band lower than would otherwise be given. Band 5 will require a basic understanding and knowledge of either the Bolsheviks or the Provisional Government. The 'Provisional' status of the government was a weakness and it did not call elections for a Constituent Assembly until it was too late. Power was shared with other groups, such as the Soviets. Kerensky could not get to grips with the widespread grievances in Russia, for example economic distress, the demands for land distribution, concessions to nationalities and above all peace. The Provisional Government continued the war and was involved with the failure of the Brusilov offensive in June-August. The crisis of the July Days showed the weakness of the Provisional Government although Lenin had to withdraw to Finland. The Kornilov Affair represented another crisis. The influence of the Bolsheviks was spreading rapidly in the Soviets and elsewhere. Trotsky became a significant leader when he joined the Bolsheviks. Above all, Lenin's leadership was decisive. His popular slogans, 'All power to the Soviets', 'Peace, land and bread' won considerable support. He also secured support among soldiers. He persuaded a reluctant Central Committee to support a coup.

## 7 By 1939, how far had Hitler resolved the domestic problems that had faced the Weimar Republic?

The key issue is Hitler's success in dealing with the domestic problems that had faced Weimar Germany. The question asks 'How far..?'. Candidates should examine both the extent and limits of the claim. It will be difficult to argue that Hitler was completely unsuccessful but many candidates might judge he was completely successful. An uncritical acceptance of this view might be worth up to Band 2 (and Band 1 might be achieved by excellent discussions) but normally answers in the highest band might be expected to consider both sides. Candidates might tackle the question either issue by issue (e.g. the economy, then government) or sequentially (Weimar then Hitler). Both can be equally valid. There is likely to be more on Hitler but answers in Bands 1 and 2 should be clear about Weimar's problems. Answers in other bands might deal with these issues generally or, in the lower bands, assume them. Weimar had political problems, emerging from military defeat and the unpopular Versailles settlement. Proportional Representation made it difficult to elect a government with stable majorities. The power of the President, e.g. the authority to suspend civil liberties, represented an authoritarian aspect that benefited the right-wing. Extremist groups on right and left had an influence greater than their numbers might suggest (e.g. Spartacist Rising and the Kapp Putsch). Weimar Germany had severe economic problems in the early 1920s and again after the Wall Street Crash. Hitler secured complete power through the Enabling Act (1933) and the establishment of a one-party state. He put down the communists and suppressed the SA, a militant right-wing group. His economic policies helped to stabilise the German economy although it can be argued that his success was exaggerated. His personal appeal, supported by powerful propaganda, contributed to his success. He united the country through a combination of populist policies and terror.

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>12</b>

**8 Why was there a successful revolution against Nicholas II but not against Stalin?**

The key issue is the contrasting threat of revolution to Nicholas II and Stalin. The question asks 'Why..?' and the answers in the two highest bands can be expected to be mostly analytical or explanatory. However, examiners would not undervalue answers that use description to underline explanation. It is reasonable to expect a fair balance in the discussions of Nicholas II and Stalin, either 60:40 or 70:30 normally leading to the award of one band lower than would otherwise be given. Band 5 will require a basic understanding and knowledge of either Nicholas II or Stalin. The question is based on a comparison but some sequential answers can still make effective points of comparison. The key to the fall of Nicholas II in 1917 was the war. Stalin avoided a major war until 1941. (The question and the syllabus end in 1939.) Nicholas was faced by diverse political parties, some of which were revolutionary, and he failed to overcome political criticism by 1917. Stalin enforced Lenin's one-party state. He went further than Lenin in imposing his will on the Bolsheviks through purges. He also purged the military. Russia faced economic problems during Nicholas II's reign and during the rule of Stalin, but Stalin turned failure to the appearance of success for Russia and for himself personally, partly through propaganda. Nicholas II was a weak man who did not give an effective lead, the opposite to Stalin. Nicholas II and Stalin had secret police who were active beyond the normal laws but the OGPU, then the NKVD, was much more effective than the tsarist Cheka. There was no chance of an effective opposition under Stalin although he continued to use the danger of revolution to justify his purges. By 1917, Nicholas II had lost his personal reputation as the Father of Russia; Stalin took on this mantle.