

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

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2010 question paper
for the guidance of teachers

9697 HISTORY

9697/11

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.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

| | | | |
|---------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 2 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010 | 9697 | 11 |

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.

| Band | Marks | Levels of Response |
|------|-------|--|
| 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 2010 | 9697 | 11 |

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

SOURCE-BASED QUESTION: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

'Kaiser William II did not want war.' 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 | Statement by the Kaiser to the Austrian Chief of Military Staff. | William II is basically peace-loving but the situation in the Balkans demands strong measures by Austria. | Y – William II did urge Austria to take strong action against Serbia. Y – He believed himself to be a man of peace. Y/N – Personal statements can be unreliable but the extract is a reasonable reflection of his personality. N – His reckless policies destabilised international peace. N – He pushed rather than restrained Austria. | Y – C agrees that William II urged Austria to take strong action. Y – D agrees that William II sought peace and went to war reluctantly. N – B sees William II only as a warmonger. N – E sees William II only as a warmonger. | Y – William was a close, even dominant, ally of Austria. Y – William II believed that Austria would secure an easy victory. N – He was not very well read. |
| B | Report by a French Ambassador to his Foreign Minister. | William II has changed from being peace-loving and is now very belligerent. Various reasons are suggested. | Y – The description of William II's personality is quite accurate as far as it goes but it is very one-sided. Y/N – Reliability is questionable because of its unevenness. N – The French writer would only see the worst aspects of William II's character. | Y – C shows strong support by William II for action by Austria. Y – E agrees strongly with the description of William II as a lover of war. N – A sees William as resorting to war reluctantly. N – in D, William II represents himself as peace-loving. | Y – William II did believe that war with France was inevitable. Y – The role of other leading figures in Germany was important and the Kaiser was swayed by advisers who favoured war. |

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 4 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010 | 9697 | 11 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| C | Private letter by the Austrian Foreign Minister to another leading Austrian politician. | William II urges Austria to take strong action, with an implied threat to Austria if action is not taken. | Y – The source is based on an actual telegram and is probably an accurate version of its content. Y – Germany was impatient with Austria. N – D shows William trying to limit the Balkan crisis. | Y – A, B and E show, to different extents, William II's determination to push Austria into war. N – D describes William II's persistent efforts for peace. | Y – Although there was the alliance with Austria, William II saw Austria as a weakening power. |
| D | Personal letter from William II to the President of the USA. | William II has made vigorous efforts to persuade Britain to intervene in the crisis. Russia had taken precipitate action. | Y – Most of the source is based on facts. Y – Russia did mobilise first. N – William II misunderstood the British political system that gave kings limited power. N – William II did not pursue clear policies to ensure peace. | Y – D – No other source shows such strenuous efforts by William II to secure peace. Y – A sees William II as seeking peace within limits. N – B, C and especially E contradict D and see William as determined to go to war. | Y – The Kaiser saw diplomacy very much as determined by monarchs, a reason why he disliked France. N – He misrepresented the British political system, in which power was held by politicians. |
| E | Extract from a book by a former US Ambassador to Germany. | William II is a warmonger and the greatest danger to peace. The telegrams between him and the Tsar were a smoke-screen. | Y – The writer had personal knowledge of William II. Y / N – Some of the personal description is reliable, some unreliable. William II did like to give a military appearance but he did not command his armies in person. Y / N – Different opinions are held about William II's sincerity in the 'Willy-Nicky' telegrams. N – The USA was neutral in 1914 (the end of the topic) but candidates might know that the USA later went to war with Germany. | Y – B gives strong support to the view in this source. Y – A, B and C give less support. N – A sees William II going to war reluctantly. N – D is a vigorous defence of William II's love of peace. | Y – Some of the personal description can be backed up by other evidence. N – Some of the statements about William II's ambitions might have been based on wild claims, not actual plans. Y / N – His attitude to the Tsar is open to debate. |

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 5 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010 | 9697 | 11 |

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 'Kaiser William II did not want war' but might make only general points about the causes of the war. 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, 'Source A agrees that Kaiser William II did not want war. Although the Kaiser was willing to go to war when there was no alternative, he preferred to avoid war, having studied it at length. Source D confirms this because William II went to great lengths to try to persuade George V of Britain to use his influence to agree to a peaceful settlement of the crisis. Russia, not Germany, precipitated war by its decision to mobilise its army.'

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, 'There is evidence for and against the claim that Kaiser William II did not want war. [In addition to L2], Source B shows that William II was determined to go to war. Not only did he believe that the German army would be victorious but he also supported warlike groups in Germany and wished to avoid his heir, who was pro-war, from becoming more popular.' The Kaiser put considerable pressure on Austria to go to war with Serbia, which would probably involve Germany, in Source C. Source E describes a man who was thoroughly devoted to war.'

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 6 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010 | 9697 | 11 |

- 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 sources can also be interpreted to show that Kaiser William II did not want war. The weight of evidence supports this conclusion. Source B is written by an enemy of Germany and therefore might be considered unreliable but it seems to be an accurate account of a conversation between the Kaiser and others. Source C can be relied on as a record of a communication between two Austrian politicians. The writer, the Austrian Foreign Minister describes the content of a telegram from the German Ambassador to Germany. The Ambassador would probably not have misrepresented the message from William II which shows that the Kaiser gave strong support to action by Austria against Serbia, knowing that Germany would probably be involved. Source E is extremely critical of William II and makes some exaggerated claims about the Kaiser's ambitions. However, it is fundamentally correct in its comments.'

- 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 conformation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example, (L4 plus) 'Source A is not completely unreliable although William II was talking to an important official in an allied country. He probably did believe that Germany and Austria could achieve their aims without going to war. Source B shows one side of the Kaiser's character. He could be excitable and unstable and these descriptions of his willingness to go to war should be balanced against his nervousness. Many of his warlike claims were made to impress people and were not completely genuine. Source E is not completely convincing because its tone is so extreme. Although the writer concedes that the Kaiser had some positive qualities, their effects only make him seem more dangerous. The 'Willy-Nicky' telegrams are dismissed too easily. William II was very ambitious and dismissed Bismarck because the minister seemed too cautious. The Kaiser preferred a policy of expansion to make Germany a world power (Weltpolitik). This does not necessarily mean that he did not prefer to achieve his aims through peaceful means, although these peaceful means included threats.'

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 7 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010 | 9697 | 11 |

- L6 AS L5, PLUS **EITHER** (a) EXPLAIN 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 Kaiser William II did not want war, the stronger claim is that the judgement is untrue. He saw himself as a powerful leader in the tradition of Frederick the Great, who strengthened Prussia through war in the eighteenth century. He allowed the military to have considerable influence over policy in Germany and appointed ministers who had similar views. The most convincing reason to reject the claim is to combine the sources with other knowledge. From his accession, he changed German policy and ultimately used the Serbian crisis to put pressure on Austria to intervene militarily although he knew that this would probably bring in Russia, which would lead to a general war.'

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 William II was very confused in his thinking. He sought to make Germany more important as an international power but ignored the realities of the situation. In Source A, Austria might have won a quick victory against Serbia in 1913 but this would be followed by Russian intervention, which the Kaiser underestimated. Source B shows the inconsistency of William II. Source D confirms that he did not understand how British policy was made. George V as king had little influence and not power over British foreign policy. Source E shows that the Kaiser was a dreamer. His actions in 1914 can also show that he did not realise the imminent danger of war.'

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 8 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010 | 9697 | 11 |

SECTION B

2 Why did the rulers of France from 1789 to 1799 fail to hold on to power?

The key issue is the reasons for the changes in government from 1789 to 1799. Examiners will look for an awareness of three main developments: the monarchy of Louis XVI, the radical rule of Robespierre and the Jacobins and the comparatively conservative Directory. Band 5 (11-13) will normally require a basic understanding and knowledge of one of these, Band 2 (18-20) might be appropriate for a sound answer that deals with two whilst some reference to all three will usually be needed for the highest band. However, examiners will not necessarily require that each period is given equal attention, even for 21-25, unless the imbalance is excessive. Louis XVI failed because of his own limitations and because of the growth of more radical groups that were probably uncontrollable. He became less popular as he mishandled the situation in 1789 and afterwards. Ministers who saw the need for reforms, such as Necker, were ignored. The issues of voting, the initial refusal to accept the Declaration of Rights, the Civil Constitution, and then his perceived alliance with foreign monarchies, led to his downfall. Radicals increased their influence and he especially lost control of Paris. The regions where his support remained strong actually weakened his hold on power because they were counter-revolutionary. Robespierre and the Jacobins were in power briefly in 1793-94. Their rise depended on the force and persuasion of their radicalism as the only means by which the revolution could be saved. However, they divided into small groups. Moderates who feared Robespierre, such as Carnot, managed to persuade the Committee of Public Safety to arrest him. The Terror alienated most people. By 1799, the Directory had lost most of its support but this had never been enthusiastic. Lack of success abroad (with the exception of Napoleon), charges of corruption, personal enrichment and higher taxes made the Directors unpopular. The Directory interfered with elections. It can be argued that the Directors (or at least Barras and Sieyès) brought about their own downfall by plotting with Napoleon.

3 Why did Britain become the first industrialised country in Europe? (You should refer to developments in *at least two* of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is focused on British industrialisation but the question requires an element of comparison ('the first industrialised country'). Candidates are asked to refer to France or Germany, as well as to Britain and examiners will accept answers that contain limited references about either or both of these continental countries. It might be argued that the increase in population was important. The population grew throughout most of Europe in the century from 1850 but the scale of the increase was greater in Britain (1750-7.5 million; 1850-almost 18 million). This provided a labour force, especially when people moved from rural to urban areas, and a market. The size of British industrial towns outstripped that of continental rivals. Britain made a quicker change to the adoption of new methods of power, especially steam. Industries became mechanised, giving rise to increased production. There was more capital available for investment in Britain and a greater willingness by the middle classes and some of the aristocracy to engage in such investment. The middle classes in particular had a greater influence in society and on government than on the continent. Governments were more open to free trade policies that helped industry. There were tariff barriers in France and Germany (until the Zollverein). Some candidates might argue that Britain was less disturbed by war than France and Germany. This is true to some extent but the consequences of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars can be underestimated. Certainly Britain was not invaded but the wars were a heavy expense. On the other hand, weaker continental competition gave an impetus to British industry.

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 9 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010 | 9697 | 11 |

4 Why did the 1848 Revolutions fail in *both* Germany and Italy?

The question asks candidates to discuss both Germany and Italy. Band 5 (11–13) will require a basic understanding and knowledge of one country. However, even the highest band will not need a 50:50 balance. 60:40 can merit any mark band and 70:30 either way might deserve one band lower than would otherwise be given. The question does not explicitly demand a comparison and can be structured in two parts. The points suggested below might be separated in answers. However, candidates can treat the question as a comparison. There was a lack of clear aims in both regions. Although anti-Austrian feeling was a common factor some wanted liberalism but not unity, others struggled for economic reasons, a minority sought unification. Some favoured a monarchy, others advocated a republic. There were different opinions about centralised rule and federalism. The middle classes tended to be preoccupied with their own interests and did not share the lower orders' priorities of land and employment. In Germany, there were divisions among the lower classes. Charles Albert of Piedmont tried to provide leadership but was ultimately ineffective. Frederick William IV of Prussia proved unreliable and turned against the rebels. Austrian military strength was important. Charles Albert of Piedmont was defeated at Custozza. In Germany, there were strong princes who used force to restore order, for example in Hesse. The nearest that Germany came to a new unified government was perhaps the Frankfurt Parliament but it proved ineffective. It highlighted the division of opinion about a new Germany, for example should there be a greater Germany with Austria or a smaller Germany excluding Austria.

5 'Governments were involved in imperialism more for defensive than aggressive reasons.' How far do you agree with this claim about the period from c.1870 to 1900? (You should refer to Britain and *at least two* other European countries in your answer.)

The key issue is the motives for involvement in New Imperialism at the end of the nineteenth century. Candidates are asked to use at least 3 countries, including Britain, as examples but there is no requirement to give equal attention to each of the selected countries. Credit will be given for the use of overseas examples and such examples will be necessary to reach Band 2 (18–20) or Band 1 (21–25). Answers in Band 1, and most of those in Band 2, will consider alternatives because imperialism was not completely defensive or aggressive. Candidates might discuss economic motives, including the search for inexpensive raw materials, markets and opportunities for investment. These might be seen as either defensive or aggressive. On the one hand, countries tried to protect themselves from more competition during a period of domestic depression. On the other hand, these motives led countries to try to exclude rivals, but the economic gains seemed limited. Imperialism was seen as a means to gain international power and reputation. For example, France sought to reassert itself after the 1870-71 defeat by Prussia. The new Italy had the dream of imperial expansion to reflect its view of itself as a major power. Britain gave priority to its growing empire rather than the continent as the symbol of its greatness. This motive could also be defensive. Egypt and East Africa were important to British interests in India. As one country moved into parts of Africa, others felt bound to establish their own regions of influence. Britain and Germany, or Britain and France, or Germany against Britain and France might be seen as examples of this. The same was true of China and other regions in the Far East. Social Darwinism might be seen today as evidence of European aggression but at the time it seemed neither aggressive nor defensive but altruistic. Individuals such as Rhodes and Carl Peters will probably be seen as aggressive. They often led where governments were forced to follow. Bismarck, Disraeli and Gladstone might be cited as examples. Governments tried to defuse possible tensions, for example at the Conference / Treaty of Berlin (1884–85) where spheres of influence were agreed, but with limited success.

| | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 10 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010 | 9697 | 11 |

6 Why was Lenin able to become the ruler of Russia in October 1917?

The key issue is the rise of Lenin as Russian leader up to 1917. There are two alternative approaches that can be taken, both equally acceptable. The first is to trace his fortunes from the beginning of the twentieth century, explaining why October 1917 was the climax. The second is to focus on 1917. Lenin proved adept at taking advantage of opportunities, for example in his return to Russia in April 1917 with the help of Germany. Before this, Lenin and the Bolsheviks had been of little importance in shaping events in Russia. However, the years before 1917 showed his determination and ability to be the leader of the minority Bolsheviks. Although in exile, he was an effective propagandist and highly organised. He was to be proved right after the February Revolution, when he withdrew support from the Provisional Government and published the April Theses, throwing in his lot with the Soviets. His advocacy of 'Peace Land and Bread' was successful in winning popular support. Although the July Days were a setback, he proved to be resilient especially after the Kornilov coup. It was Lenin who provoked the Bolsheviks into seizing power in October. Candidates might argue that Lenin's success was facilitated by the weakness and failure of rivals. Kerensky did not provide the leadership that would win wide support. Some of his policies proved fatal, for example the continuation of the war against Germany. The question ends in October 1917. References to the later period can be included in a brief conclusion but more substantial discussions will not be relevant.

7 How far had Mussolini achieved his aims in domestic policy by 1939?

This question has two specifics. It is about domestic policy and discussions of foreign affairs will not be given credit. The end date of 1939 precludes studies of a later period. It might be argued that Mussolini's most important aim was to gain and secure personal power. His programme was to impose an extreme right-wing government on Italy and to carry out political, economic and social reforms that would reflect this. In 1924, his Fascists won a large majority but he went further to crush the opposition. The Fascists were probably responsible for the murder of Matteotti, a socialist leader. This was a part of the violence used by Mussolini's supporters such as the Blackshirts. Representatives of other political groups withdrew from the Chamber of Deputies (the Aventine Secession), giving Mussolini a free hand. In 1925 he gained complete power and used it to curb the trade unions, much of the press and independent judicial officials. However, his search for complete control was modified by a realistic willingness to compromise with the powerful papacy; hence the Lateran Treaties (1929). He co-operated with big business but also carried through large-scale public works, for example building new towns and draining the Pontine Marshes. By 1939, the largest industrial enterprises were state run. To a large extent, Mussolini had achieved his aims of a Corporative State. Mussolini did assert personal primacy in Italy. He was a showman who embraced the media, was happy in public appearances and an effective orator. However, the practical gains were exaggerated by propaganda. He aimed to be the new Caesar, restoring the splendours and emulating the achievements of the Roman Empire. The adoption of the name 'Fascists' was significant. Mussolini copied the figure of Caesar in publications and medallions. Roman architecture was copied and Roman ceremonies were the model for Fascist celebrations. This was a thoroughly impractical element of his rule. The lower classes benefited from some state-controlled activities such as holiday camps but their standard of living was hardly improved. The trains did run on time - or at least the international expresses did when local railway services had to give way. A number of agricultural reforms had limited success, for example the Battle for Grain when unsuitable land was brought under cultivation. Inflation remained high. It might be argued by some candidates that Mussolini did not intend to exert the same ferocious dictatorship as in Nazi Germany and the USSR. Censorship was not complete. Critics who kept the expression of their opinions within check escaped prosecution. There was little organised anti-Semitism before 1939.

| | | | |
|---------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 11 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2010 | 9697 | 11 |

- 8 How far was the economy of Russia different from the economies of western Europe before 1914? (You should refer to Russia and *at least two* of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The question asks candidates to refer to at least two countries other than Russia but there is latitude about the degree of detail needed because the main focus should be on Russia. The question asks 'How far?' and the best answers in Band 1 (21–25) and most of those in Band 2 (18–20) will consider some alternatives. Candidates might argue that the major difference was that the Russian economy was still heavily dependent on agriculture and in a primitive form when compared with the major countries in western Europe. Serfdom had been abolished (1861) but the condition of most of the peasantry, who comprised a very large proportion of the population, changed little after emancipation. There was little incentive to produce more or to modernise. Redemption payments were heavy and the *mir* inhibited change. Russia had a small middle class and economic policies were mostly driven by the need to satisfy the reactionary interests of the large landholders. Agriculture was also a major element of the economies of major countries in western Europe but it was becoming modernised. Fewer people were employed in it but production increased with changed methods. However, there were signs of change in Russia. Railways were built, allowing Russia to export more, but the exports were heavily agricultural. It did not have the industry to compete with other countries. Industrial production was small scale, not in large factories that were increasingly common in the west. Witte was Minister of Finance (1892–1903) and then Prime Minister (1905–06). He saw the need to industrialise to avoid reliance on imports. This involved the encouragement of foreign investment in Russia. He was very successful, especially in gaining loans from France. However, the adverse exchange rate meant that loans came at a heavy price. Production of coal, iron and oil increased rapidly and, at the turn of the century, the annual growth rate outstripped that in western Europe. But total output still lagged behind more advanced countries. Stolypin (Prime Minister 1906–11) tried to improve agriculture by encouraging the growth of the kulak class and loosening the hold of the *mir*. Production did improve but not enough to change the situation radically. He was not supported by Nicholas II and the majority of the governing classes.