



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 1: HIS1K

Russia and Germany, 1871–1914

Mark Scheme

2009 examination - June series

This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#) which is being introduced for examinations from June 2010

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the operational exams.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2009 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

Specimen Mark Scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards
GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation**HIS1K: Russia and Germany, 1871–1914****Question 1**

- 01** Explain why there was rapid industrial growth in Germany in the years c1890 to c1910.
(12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

The key dates here are approximate, dealing with economic trends, not specific events. The focus of answers should be on explanation of the reasons for the growth of industrialisation rather than description. Germany, especially Prussia, was already industrialised by c1880 but was about to enter a phase of extremely rapid expansion, often known as the Second Industrial Revolution – the expansion of heavy industry and the emergence of new industries such as chemicals and electric power. Some answers may also make effective references to the modernisation of the armaments industry; and naval developments, including merchant shipping. Key factors behind this include the existence of the Ruhr as an industrial powerhouse, political backing for the alliance of ‘Steel and Rye’, the emergence of big industrial conglomerates like Siemens-AEG, the arms race, and the superiority of Germany’s technical education and training. One feature of good answers may be the capacity to look back from c1910 to sum up a period of exceptional development.

Question 1

- 02** How successful were the rulers of Germany in dealing with social change in the years 1890 to 1914? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Where Question 1(a) is about the causes of industrialisation, this question is about the consequences. Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence that suggests the Kaiser's government was successful in neutralising internal opposition against the evidence that suggests otherwise. One feature of good quality answers may be the ability to differentiate – between aspects of failure as against success; or assessing changes over time – such as the Kaiser's good intentions with the New Course dribbling away after 1894. The 'rulers of Germany' indicates more than just the personality of Wilhelm II who was not always 'hands-on' in domestic affairs, but should show some awareness of the role of his Chancellors, of key advisers like Eulenburg, or of pressure groups such as the Army, the Navy and the right-wing Leagues.

Points which suggest they were successful might include:

- in 1890, Bismarck was dropped and Wilhelm II and Caprivi launched the New Course. There was no great power vacuum or political crisis caused by Bismarck's fall.
- after 1890, the Reichstag remained politically weak. This was partly because Bismarck had ensured by 1890 that the constitutional system was skewed in favour of the imperial government and partly because the Reichstag opposition was undermined by the divisions within the Liberals and could only rarely outvote the government anyway
- the SPD was outwardly committed to a revolutionary Marxist programme but, in reality, was dominated by patriotic and law-abiding moderates. In 1914, the vast majority of the SPD voted in favour of war credits for the Kaiser's War
- the Catholic *Zentrum* was permanently scarred by Bismarck's 'Kulturkampf' and was desperately anxious to avoid being seen as politically unreliable
- industrial growth and economic success strengthened support for the political system. Despite hardships, most Germans knew they were living in an age of material progress
- the army and the 'military-industrial complex' kept its prestige and political influence
- in 1914 there was a surge of national unity at the outbreak of war.

Points which suggest they were not successful might include:

- the Social Democrats were not suppressed by the Anti-Socialist Law, or by Bismarck's attempts to 'kill socialism with kindness' – they were able to form a vociferous opposition group in the Reichstag. By 1890 they were already taking 25% of the vote in industrial areas and continued to build on this in almost every election afterwards. In 1912 they made an electoral breakthrough, becoming the biggest single party in the Reichstag
- SPD opposition was strong and effective against the expansion of the Navy, leading to major battles in the Reichstag, as in 1909
- the Kaiser and his backers were very afraid, almost paranoid, of the rise of socialism, as was shown for example in the Kaiser's extreme statements at the time of the Berlin tramworkers strike in 1900
- the prestige of the ruling elites slipped badly in the later years of the reign, taking heavy blows from the Eulenburg scandal and the *Daily Telegraph* Affair. The Kaiser himself was widely ridiculed in satirical magazines
- the Zabern Affair of 1913 led to the Reichstag passing a vote of no confidence (230–nil) against the Kaiser's government and the role of the Army in politics. Some historians claim it was fear of socialism that drove the rulers of Germany into *Weltpolitik* and war.

Question 2**03** Explain why Tsar Nicholas II issued the 'October Manifesto' in 1905.*(12 marks)**Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)***Generic Mark Scheme**

Nothing written worthy of credit.

0

- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

The 'October Manifesto' was a concession to Russia's Liberal opposition in order to split them away from the other, more radical strands of the 1905 revolution. There should be awareness of a range of opposition, including at least some of: revolutionary movements; Liberals wanting constitutional reform and possibly the national minorities. There should also be some awareness of the role of Sergius Witte, sacked in 1903 in favour of the conservative 'hawk' around Plehve but now brought back to rescue Tsar Nicholas from the mess he was in. One feature of good answers may be the ability to explain how democratic concessions were forced on the Tsar, not given willingly – he quickly sacked Witte again in 1906 once the immediate crisis was over. As usual, we cannot expect answers to be comprehensive but better answers will explain some selected factors effectively, using brief and accurate evidence.

Question 2

- 04** How successful was the Tsarist regime in maintaining internal political stability between October 1905 and 1914? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest they were successful against others which do not. Of course there was not complete success – the repression of opposition was a long and harsh process in 1906, there was Liberal dissatisfaction with the *duma* after 1906, there were many violent strikes such as the Lena River goldfields strike of 1912, and growing political opposition to Tsarism. Against this, however, it can be strongly argued that Stolypin carried through successful economic policies, especially in agrarian reforms, and that the strikes and industrial unrest of the time was no more than the growing pains of the industrial economy, and similar to the problems experienced in successful countries like Germany and the USA. Thus it can be argued that, although 1905 nearly toppled Tsarism, as soon as the Tsar went back to trusting clever and capable ministers like Stolypin

most of the problems facing the regime proved to be manageable and that by the time of the 300th anniversary of the dynasty in 1913, Tsardom was actually as politically stable as ever and with a lot more economic prosperity. Many historians argue that Russia was industrialising rapidly in the years before 1914, to the point where the German generals were afraid of Russian military potential. Others argue that Stolypin's policy of repression mixed with agrarian reform was already proving effective by the time of his death in 1911.

One feature of the better responses may be the ability to differentiate – between the Tsar as opposed to the ministers, or between periods of failure and periods of success.

Question 3

05 Explain why the *Dreikaiserbund* was formed by 1873. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

The so-called Three Emperors League was the re-alignment of the European monarchies after the upheavals of 1870–1871 and the emergence of the new rising power of unified Germany. From Bismarck's point of view, it was a device to ensure the continued diplomatic isolation of France and the neutralisation of any French drive to gain allies for *revanche*. Better answers will not only see the arrangement from Bismarck's point of view, however, but may look at why Russia and Austria-Hungary were receptive to Bismarck's proposals.

Question 3

- 06** How successful was Bismarck in managing Germany's relationship with Russia in the years 1873 to 1890? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Before the Balkan Crisis blew up in Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1875, followed by the 'Bulgarian atrocities' of 1876, the Russo-Turkish War in 1877 and the Congress of Berlin in 1878, there were no issues between Russia and Germany. In 1872–1873, Russia had joined the Three Emperors' League with Germany and Austria-Hungary but the 1875–1878 Balkan Crisis put this relationship under strain. Bismarck was keen to avoid confrontation and he saw no German interests in the Balkans at the time (later, of course there were important German concerns in the region) and his role as mediator and 'honest broker' at Berlin was aimed at keeping Russia onside. But the Congress involved depriving Russia of gains made at the earlier San Stefano. Bismarck was forced to some extent to choose sides. In 1879, Germany and Austria-Hungary formed the Dual Alliance, linking Germany to Russia's major rival in the Balkans. The

Dreikaiserbund was renewed in 1881 but during the 1880s there was considerable opposition to it in Russia and it was not renewed but replaced by the complicated Reinsurance Treaty of 1887. This then fell apart in 1890, helping to cause Bismarck's political downfall in the process. Answers may argue either that all this shows Bismarck ultimately failed to 'manage' the relationship with Russia. Others, perhaps the majority, will argue that Bismarck played a difficult hand as cunningly as anyone could have done; and it was the fault of the Kaiser that Russia was driven into a military alliance with France in 1893–1894 – the very thing Bismarck had so cleverly prevented for more than 20 years.

Better answers – overall difficulty of maintaining relationship – judgement – success/failure.