



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2010**

**AS History 1041**

**HIS1K**

**Unit 1K**

**Russia and Germany, 1871–1914**

**Final**

***Mark Scheme***

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

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

---

**June 2010**

**GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation**

**HIS1K: Russia and Germany, 1871–1914**

**Question 1**

**01** Why did Bismarck begin a campaign against Socialism in 1878? (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**

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merit according to the generic levels scheme.**

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Bismarck launched a campaign against Socialism.

Candidates may include the following factors:

- Socialism was an international creed which conflicted with Bismarck's aim to promote German nationalism, the appeal of Socialism was to workers around the world and the eventual aim was that the boundaries between nation states would be destroyed. Therefore Bismarck perceived Socialists as a threat in the same way as he had

previously seen Catholics as one. Their allegiance could be seen as directed outside Germany

- ideologically Bismarck was opposed to Socialist plans to overthrow capitalism. Much of his support came from forces opposed to the ideas of Socialism. He was also genuinely disturbed by events such as the Paris Commune and the violence carried out by many Socialist groups
- linked to the violence of Socialist groups across Europe were the two assassination attempts on Wilhelm I in 1878, the second of these did seriously injure the aging Emperor and gave Bismarck support for his anti Socialist campaign
- Socialism was also a creed that could be seen as divisive within Germany, many saw the Socialists as preaching class war, which was opposed to Bismarck's desire to promote unity. Some historians have claimed that the campaign was a deliberate attempt to unite opposition to Socialism as a means of gaining support, although this can be disputed
- candidates at the top of the mark scheme may comment that these attempts were not really causes of the campaign, but excuses which gave Bismarck the necessary support to carry anti Socialist reforms through.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example, they may link the violence used by Socialist groups elsewhere to the attempts made on the Emperor's life in 1878.

---

**Question 1**

- 02** How successful were German governments in dealing with the challenges presented by the SPD in the years 1880 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**

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merit according to the generic levels scheme.**

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points that suggest that the German governments were successful in dealing with the challenge of the SPD against those that suggest it was not.

Arguments that suggest that German governments were successful in dealing with the SPD are:

- the law made it very difficult for the SPD to function and also led to a short term fall in electoral support for Socialism. Meetings to promote Socialism were banned and the party had to function from outside Germany
- Bismarck also used positive methods such as 'State Socialism' to combat the SPD, it can be argued that these methods were successful and did much to improve conditions for the working class within Germany
- with the fall of Bismarck there was initially more sympathy for Socialist demands within the German Government, Caprivi's 'New Course' aimed to deal with Socialism by kindness. However this approach ended with Caprivi's fall from office and the government resorted to repression and harassment in order to deal with Socialism
- despite government harassment the SPD remained committed to peaceful and reformist Socialism, and it can be debated whether they did indeed represent a threat to German Governments. SPD deputies were willing to work with Liberal deputies and to support Imperial foreign policies. They were also willing to vote for increased military spending and to support the German government on the outbreak of war.

Arguments suggesting that the German governments were not successful in dealing with the challenge of Socialism are:

- the SPD continued to grow, despite the Anti-Socialist Law and continued repression. The party moved its organisation outside Germany and carried on promoting Socialism. After an initial fall, the number of Socialist deputies continued to rise right up to 1914 when they formed a powerful bloc in the Reichstag as the largest party with 110 seats
- the government's policy of 'State Socialism' may have gone some way to improving conditions but Germany remained a divided society with many living in great poverty. The rise in support for the SPD suggests that the reforms put forward by government did very little to stop support for Socialism. The SPD were also able to use their growing influence to bargain for further reforms which increased their influence
- government attempts to pass further anti-Socialist legislation in the late 1890s met with failure as Liberals refused to support the Anti-Union Bill and the Subversion Bill. Although Socialism did not mount a violent or unconstitutional challenge to the German government by 1914 the SPD was a considerable democratic force.

Good answers are likely to cover a range of issues with some balance regarding successful failure. Answers at the top level will contain consistent assessment and support.

---

**Question 2****03** Explain why Alexander III followed a policy of ‘Russification’.*(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**

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merit according to the generic levels scheme.**

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Alexander followed a policy of ‘Russification’

The concept of ‘Russification’ had been apparent in Russia before the accession of Alexander III, however during his reign it became a distinct and official policy, this was because:

- the policy became part of the overall attempt by Alexander to reassert the authority of Tsarist government and to move against the Liberalism of his father (Alexander II)
- Alexander was encouraged by Pobedonostev who was very influential on the policies followed by the new Tsar. Pobedonostev was also representative of the influence of the Russian Orthodox Church which sought to convert many of the subject peoples
- a large percentage of the peoples ruled by the Russian Empire were non-Russians, the policy of Russification was an attempt to impose uniformity and loyalty upon subject peoples. This was spurred on by Polish revolts in the 1860s

- Russification was an assertion of 'Pan-Slavism' or aggressive Russian nationalism, at the same time it was an attempt to stifle possible nationalist consciousness in any areas that could be seen as a threat to the unity of the Empire
- the policy of Russification was also popular with influential groups such as land owning families and bureaucrats who supported the order and uniformity of the policy, and the army especially in border areas where the loyalty of subject groups could be doubted.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they may link the issue of minority groups to Pan-Slavism and attempts to unify the Empire.

---

**Question 2**

- 04** How successful was Alexander III in strengthening tsarist autocracy in the years 1881 to 1894? (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**

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merit according to the generic levels scheme.**

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points that suggest that Alexander was successful in strengthening the authority of Tsarist Autocracy against those that suggest he was not.

---

Factors suggesting success might include:

- Alexander was determined to reassert autocratic rule within Russia after the reforms of his father. Although he could not completely undo the reforms of the previous reign, many of his policies were designed to bring back power to the central government and into his own hands
- policies to deal with opposition became more stringent and the Okhrana was set up. The government had the right to interfere with civil liberties, remove elected officials, set up military police courts and to suppress publications critical of the regime
- in law courts the Ministry of the Interior took on greater powers such as the approval of Land Captains. The Ministry of Justice also had more say over the appointment of judges
- the constitutional reforms proposed by reforming ministers in 1881 (in progress when Alexander II was assassinated) were abandoned and reform minded ministers were sacked
- there were executions and harsh treatments such as exile to Siberian labour camps for opponents of the regime
- the Zemstva Act reduced representation for the peasants and increased the control of landowners
- access to education for women and for the lower classes was greatly reduced
- the policy of Russification took away the rights of many minority groups, both religious ie Jewish or nationalities
- there were improvements in the economy where the Peasants' Land Bank was set up, and the tax system was made fairer, there were also reforms in conditions for urban workers
- industrialisation was pushed ahead, and the Russian economy spurred on by state direction and injections of foreign capital began to grow rapidly.

Factors suggesting that he was not successful might include:

However, although Alexander's changes did reassert the power of the Tsarist government many historians have seen his policies as the beginning of the slide towards revolution.

- his policies led to increased revolutionary activity because of the harshness of his repression. Brutal treatment of dissidents led to increased support as did the discriminatory policies against non-Russians, a huge proportion of revolutionaries came from persecuted groups
- although economic progress was made the growth of the urban working class and the poor conditions in which they lived and worked created a fertile ground for revolutionary ideas and increasing trade union activity
- despite laws against student radical groups many students were members of unofficial organisations
- although Alexander's reign appeared to be peaceful this was only because of the strict repressive measures used, in reality by refusing to implement much needed reforms Alexander actually set Russia on the path to revolution.

Good answers are likely to show a balance between success and failure, together with consistent assessment.

---

**Question 3****05** Why did Russia sign an alliance with France in 1894? (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****Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merit according to the generic levels scheme**

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Russia signed an alliance with France in 1894:

- Germany's refusal to renew the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia in 1890 highlighted Russian isolation in international affairs. Russia did try further approaches to gain German friendship in the early 1890s but these failed leading Russia to look to the other isolated European power for support
- France was another European power isolated largely because of German policy, once ideological differences were overcome there was a strong argument for an alliance to break out of isolation. Both powers were also prospective colonial rivals to Britain, but seem to have little conflict with each other
- although republican France seemed to be an unlikely ally for the tsarist autocracy the French agreed to help control the activities of Russian Nihilist groups which improved relations

- an important factor was the financial benefits of the relationship. French capital was loaned to Russia helping with the expansion of the Russian economy, this was vital to the development of Russia at the time.  
The military alliance which followed these improvements was very popular especially in France, and rescued both countries from diplomatic isolation.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they may explain that both powers were isolated and therefore an alliance between them became more attractive.

---

**Question 3**

- 06** How far was the alliance between Russia and France responsible for the worsening relationship between Germany and Russia in the years 1894 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**

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merit according to the generic levels scheme.**

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest that the alliance between France and Russia was an important factor against those which suggest that it was not.

Factors suggesting importance might include:

- a key aim of Bismarck's foreign policy had been to maintain the isolation of France and hence avoid any possibility of revenge for the Franco-Prussian war and the return to France of Alsace and Lorraine. With Bismarck's fall the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia was abandoned leaving the way clear for improved relations between France and Russia
- initially there seems to have been little concern about the alliance in Germany, possibly because there was little threat from the alliance although the alliance was directed militarily against a German attack on either power. When Russian interest turned back to Europe after the defeat by Japan, and with the entry of Britain as the partner of France in the Entente Cordiale and later in the Triple Entente, Germany began to feel increasingly isolated and surrounded which led to a worsening of relations
- events such as the Agadir Crisis show Germany's attempts to shake the Triple Entente
- in the years leading up to 1914 the relationship between France and Russia certainly affected German planning for war. The Schlieffen Plan assumed that if war broke out that it would be necessary to fight on two fronts, and on the outbreak of war in July/August 1914 it was obvious that Germany assumed that any attack against either power would involve the other in the war.

Factors suggesting that the alliance was not important might include:

Despite this there are many other factors which suggest that the alliance between Russia and France was not the most important factor affecting relations between Germany and Russia:

- the support given by Germany to Austria-Hungary in the Balkans, over the issue of the annexation of Bosnia Herzegovina in 1908, during the Balkan wars 1912 and 1913, and in the crisis that led to war in 1914
- Germany's aggressive interference in colonial issues such as the Agadir crisis can be viewed as an attempt to shake British/French relations rather than those with Russia
- the turning of Russian interests from the Far East back to European issues after her defeat in the Russo-Japanese war also made conflict of interest in the Balkan area more likely, before this conflict between Russia and Germany seemed unlikely.

Good answers should consider the argument that the alliance did damage relations but also be aware that it is likely that other factors played a key role. These answers should also include consistent assessment.