

GCE 2004
June Series



Mark Scheme

History Alternative J Units 1, 4 and 6 (5041/6041)

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 from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

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.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester, M15 6EX.

Dr. Michael Cresswell Director General

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners**

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:*Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:*Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

Alternative J: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes, c1848-1956**AS Unit 1: The Origins and Consolidation of Totalitarian Regimes, 1918-1939****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the significance of “world revolution” in relation to the struggle for power between Stalin and Trotsky. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. disagreement between Stalin and Trotsky over whether to spread revolution. 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. Permanent Revolution was Trotsky’s priority while Stalin preferred Socialism in One Country from 1925. 2-3

- (b) Use Source A and **either Source B or Source C** and your own knowledge.

Compare the reasons suggested for removing political opposition in **Source A** with those suggested in **either Source B or Source C**. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. Source A refers to “different views”, Source B to “if he lifts his hand against the state”, Source C to “major challenge”. 1-2
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. Source A is pointing out ideological divides within the Party, Source B comments on terror already applied to Rohm and the SA for promoting Second Revolution, and extends it to “everyone”, Source C refers to a political opponent who openly criticised Fascist violence in elections and demanded cancellation of the results. 3-5

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. explores different reasons for using terror. Source A infers the threat to the transition “from capitalism to socialism in the USSR”, Source B is direct – terror is part of the legal machinery of Nazi Germany in 1934 as Hitler became “the supreme judge of the German people”, Source C raises rivalry between Mussolini and Matteotti “although not personally implicated” and/or “the moderate socialist”. **6-7**

(c) Use **Source A** and **either Source B or Source C** and your own knowledge.

Explain the importance of the removal of opponents, in relation to other factors, in the consolidation of power of the totalitarian regimes you have studied.

You should refer in your answer to the Soviet Union 1929-1939 and **either** Germany 1933-1939 **or** Italy 1922-1939. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* the sources. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

From the sources re. removal of opponents – e.g. Source A refers to Trotsky “Trotskyism has completely different views”, Source B specifically refers to the removal of Rohm “those who were mainly guilty of this treason” and Source C refers to Matteotti “the moderate socialist Giacomo Matteotti, a critic”. These need to be identified and placed in context.

From the sources re. other factors – e.g. Source A refers to ideological motives “The party proceeds” implies consolidation around one identity. Source B refers to centralised power of the state “I gave the order”, “treason” and creation of national identity “German people”. Source C refers to electoral manipulation, terror “tolerance of political violence” and personal rivalry “a critic of Mussolini” as factors in consolidation.

From own knowledge – the removal of the opposition must form part of a balanced response considering e.g.

- the personality of the leaders (megalomania, messianic leader, Duce), their power base and their skill in manipulating the political environment
- opposition weakness/error/misjudgement to consider; did the opposition pave the way for totalitarianism?
- connivance of other politicians/interest groups.

At Level 1 answers are likely to consider a limited range of undeveloped points; there will be greater range and selectivity of points and some supportive description at Level 2. At Level 3 responses will have greater accuracy, range and depth and will make some links to the “importance” of the factors identified, though these will not necessarily be sustained. At Level 4 the case will be argued more strongly, considering whether the removal of opposition paved the way for totalitarianism, with some explanation of the importance of other factors often linking the factors themselves. At Level 5 the answers will engage more significantly in debate, cross-referencing sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the relationship between the removal of the opposition and the factors that enabled the establishment of a totalitarian regime.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “coalitions” in relation to Stalin’s accession to power by 1929. *(3 marks)*

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract e.g. the other people Stalin worked with to out-manoeuvre his rivals. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context e.g. the initial coalition against Trotsky, the RW coalition against Kamenev and Zinoviev, and then the coalition with his allies in the Party organisation against the RW and Bukharin. Stalin could spot weaknesses in his opponents and never took them on all at once but picked them off. He often hid behind his coalition partners. **2-3**

(b) Explain why Stalin took on the “United Opposition” from 1926 to 1927. (7 marks)

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements e.g. some understanding that the United Opposition were the left of the party and Stalin wanted to remove them. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material e.g. personal rivalry with Trotsky, Trotsky’s demands for greater democracy within the Party, disagreement over NEP, ideological dispute over Permanent Revolution, Stalin’s opportunism. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance e.g. Stalin’s priority was to win power, or to keep peasant support by retaining NEP. **6-7**

(c) “Stalin gained power in the years 1924-1929 only because his rivals made mistakes.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Answers need to investigate aspects of the rivals' mistakes as no one recognised the extent of Stalin's ambition until too late e.g. Trotsky and other members of the Politburo did not publish Lenin's Testament; Trotsky lacked a power base in the party to attack Socialism in One Country so was vulnerable to factionalism; Kamenev and Zinoviev realised too late that Stalin had massively increased power after Trotsky resigned as Commissar for War in 1925; Bukharin belatedly opposed Stalin's economic policy with Tomsky, Rykov and Sovnarkom but opposition came to nothing.

Answers may be focused on Stalin's rivalry with Trotsky, but should extend beyond to reach the higher levels.

Answers need to balance rivals' mistakes with other factors e.g.

- Stalin was able to use his power base in the Party to expel the rivals Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev in 1927 – political manipulation, and then to readmit just Kamenev and Zinoviev. He built up loyal support from Lenin Enrolment. He stored information on personnel.
- Stalin used the political organisation to his advantage – control of the Party press.
- Stalin played a clever tactical game to outwit his rivals.
- Propaganda stressed the strength of USSR under Stalin and the 5 year Plans, and the importance of national identity.

At Level 1 answers will be brief, and may focus only on the given reason for Stalin's success e.g. the other politicians did not realise until too late how ambitious he was. At Level 2 answers may make relevant comments on the failing of his rivals and link to the question **or** may describe other reasons for Stalin's success e.g. his exploitation of the Lenin legacy, administrative power base, opportunism and ambition. At Level 3 answers will begin to consider a range of reasons explaining Stalin's success. The answer may lack weight/balance e.g. explains that Bukharin was politically naïve and realised the threat from Stalin too late, but is weaker on "other factors". At Level 4 the answer will show a balanced and broad understanding of the question e.g. considers the relative importance of several reasons. At Level 5 there will be judgement about the relative importance of various reasons.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “the failures of Parliamentary democracy” in **either** the Weimar Republic 1928-33 **or** Italy 1918-22? (3 marks)

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract e.g. the failures of the Weimar Republic to sort out the economic crisis after 1929 **or** fears of a socialist revolution in Italy – Biennio Rosso. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context e.g. government responses to crises in post-war Italy or in Germany after 1928: the reliance on Presidential rule by decree in Germany when the Chancellors were unable to pass legislation through the Reichstag – explains the Nazi challenge to multi-party government, **or** five weak Liberal governments in Rome meant five Prime Ministers in the years 1918-22, rising unemployment, growing Socialist power, d’Annunzio. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why democratic ideas were challenged **either** by the Nazis in Germany 1928-34 **or** by the Fascists in Italy 1918-1925. (7 marks)

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements e.g. general comments on apparent weakness of democratic government that encouraged dissent. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material e.g. financial support from big business (Thyssen, Fiat), for challenging the Trade Unions, Nazi and Fascist commitment to anti-democratic ideology seeing multi-party Reichstag/Parliament as weak, democratic government in both cases was associated with a humiliating/inadequate peace. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance e.g. examines ideological, financial and opportunist motives for the challenge to democracy but may conclude that the main reason was personal aggrandisement by Hitler or Mussolini. **6-7**

- (c) “Democratic government had already been replaced by a dictatorship.”

Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement in relation to **either** Nazi Germany by the end of 1933 **or** Fascist Italy by the end of 1924. (15 marks)

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion involving generalisation that could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4 but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Answers need to look at events in either Germany or Italy to examine the extent of dictatorship before 1933/1924. Good answers will show a clear understanding of essential differences between the two systems possibly focusing on multi/single party government, the powers of and constraints on the leader of the government, respect for human rights and tolerance of individuality.

Answers relating to Germany may well see democracy being undermined as the Nazis seized power, though some traces of democracy remained. In Italy the process was far more ambiguous, for Mussolini moved to a more authoritarian stance but did not replace democracy; instead he mainly worked within it.

Germany: indicative comment only

Remnants of democracy:

- Hindenburg remained President
- Survival of the Länder to 1934
- Conflict with Röhm/SA
- Army as a possible focus of opposition
- Hitler depended on traditional elites e.g. business and bureaucratic support but some opposed e.g. Papen

Emerging dictatorship

- Suspension of human rights with the Decree for the Protection of People and State, February 28 1933
- Enabling Act gave wide powers in theory for 4 years
- Legal Revolution to establish the National Government
- Process of Gleichschaltung well under way e.g. single party government from July 1933, Trade Unions replaced by DAF
- Propaganda intensifying 1933
- Increased role of terror by SA and Gestapo

Italy: indicative comment only

Remnants of democracy

- Made concessions to the church, industrialists and agrarians
- Opposition persisted e.g. Socialists still stood in April 1924 elections, Matteotti was murdered June 1924
- Press censorship was not introduced until 1924
- Opposition parties persisted though their meetings were banned 1924
- Held power through the King

Emerging dictatorship

- Mussolini had been granted Emergency Powers for one year
- Mussolini created the Fascist Grand Council over which he had control
- Moving towards a one party state as some parties amalgamated with Fascist party e.g. Nationalist Association
- Mussolini created a new militia mainly from Fascist squads. Increasing use of violence to crush opposition.
- Acerbo Law July 1923: party gaining the most votes in an election, provided they gained more than 25%, would take 2/3 seats in Parliament. Replaced proportional representation.

At Level 1 answers will be brief, and may focus on one aspect of consolidation of dictatorship or the survival of democracy e.g. emergence of the new leader Fuhrer/Duce. At Level 2 answers may consider several aspects of consolidation of the dictatorship/survival of democracy **or** may describe the process of consolidation/survival of democracy with some links to the question. At Level 3 answers will begin to address the destruction of democratic government and its replacement with one-party dictatorship. The answer may lack weight e.g. a narrow interpretation of the question or may lack balance e.g. no consideration of how complete the dictatorship was. At Level 4 the answer will show a balanced and broad understanding of the question identifying liberal and democratic ideas that were replaced by dictatorship e.g. multi-party to one-party government, elected to unanswerable leadership. At Level 5 there will be judgement about how completely democracy had been destroyed e.g. consideration of surviving power bases outside the dictatorship.

Alternative J: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes, c1848-1956**A2 Unit 4: Totalitarian Ideologies, Economic, Social and Foreign Policies, 1848-1956****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Explain what is meant by “an international system that extended beyond national boundaries” in the context of Marxist ideology. (5 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. spreading of revolution from one country to another. 1
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge, e.g. long term Marxist goal of permanent revolution via adoption of Communism worldwide. 2-3
- L3: As Level 2, with developed reference to both the source and own knowledge, e.g. Marxist assertion that Communism will inevitably be established throughout the world as it is spontaneously adopted when benefits are recognised. 4-5

- (b) Use **Sources C** and **D** and your own knowledge.

How fully do **Sources C** and **D** explain the importance of expansionism in fascist ideology? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. 3-5
- L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. 6-8
- L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. 9-10

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 are likely to note that Source C refers to ‘acquisition’ and Source D to ‘force’. Answers at Level 2 will provide more detailed assessment, e.g. Source C suggests the extension of past expansionism while Source D talks of the Nietzschean ‘will to power’. By Level 3 candidates will draw conclusions about the sufficiency of the extracts, e.g. by noting that Source C refers to pre-1914 but was written in 1924 and Source D talks of tradition but is dated 1932. At Level 4 the differing nature of the extracts may be used to help in reaching a judgement, e.g. neither refers to specific precursors for their expansionist views (sources) but they do relate to the racial/imperial bases for expansionism (knowledge).

(c) Use **Sources A, B, C and D** and your own knowledge.

“Ideas dating from the nineteenth century were the main factor in explaining why the regimes of Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini desired increased international status.” Assess the validity of this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. 1-4

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. 5-8

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. 9-11

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. 12-13

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. 14-15

Indicative content

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question.

Answers should consider both a range of factors and the extent to which these factors varied over time. Source A refers to Communist internationalism, which may be evaluated as a motivating force for Stalin alongside security considerations, which are touched on in Source B. Source C makes claims for development from the position under the Second Reich, whose 'frontiers...were anything but logical', then hints at '*lebensraum*' as 'the policy of the future'. Source D focuses on the imperative to throw off past 'slavery to foreigners' in terms which recall Nietzsche's writings. There is a strong case to be made against the proposal, i.e. to argue that inter-war factors were the most significant.

At Level 1 the focus is likely to be on one particular aspect and a limited time scale. At Level 2, the response should make a range of source references although not necessarily in depth and will present a brief survey recognising change and identifying issues connected with the specified factors. By Level 3 the grasp of the issues will be more comprehensive and the use of sources and own knowledge will be more balanced; appreciation of the time scale will be good. At Level 4 understanding of change and continuity will be thorough with conclusions drawn from both sources and own knowledge. At Level 5 judgment will be securely based upon a sound understanding of the impact of contextual factors over time.

Section B

Question 2 onward

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: ***Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

1-6

- L2: **Either**
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or**
Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**
- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Question 2

“Stalin’s economic policy was rapid industrialisation at any cost.”

Assess the validity of this view with reference to the control and development of Soviet industry and agriculture in the years 1929 to 1941. *(20 marks)*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers should identify factors which fall into industry and agriculture control and development categories, and be aware of the changes in relative importance at different points in the development of Stalin’s economic policy in the prescribed period. Evidence of economic policy might be provided in the form of statistics, perhaps broken down into class A/B industries and agriculture. The human cost, especially the labour camp system and dekulakisation, is another aspect which should merit developed consideration. The distinction between ideology and practice, e.g. control of ‘commanding heights’ and drive to ‘catch up’ with the West, may provide some structure.

At Level 1 answers will be superficial, perhaps covering only one aspect, e.g. development of industry. By Level 2, information on at least two aspects will be given. At Level 3 there should be the beginnings of judgement, with a more balanced assessment emerging at Level 4. At this level, areas of overlap should also be identified. To reach Level 5, answers should show awareness of differing priorities at different times and reach an evaluation reflecting the complexity of the situation.

Question 3

“The Nazi-Soviet Pact showed Stalin’s failure to achieve the foreign policy aims that he had been pursuing in the years 1929 to 1939.”

Assess the validity of this view with reference to ideology and state security.
(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers should identify both ideological and security considerations, and be aware of the changes in relative importance of various aims at different points in the development of Stalin’s foreign policy in the prescribed period. References to aims might range from the Communist ‘imperatives’ to the attempts to make alliances to the stated goal of ‘catching up’ with the developed West. Both ideology and practicality encompass economic/social (e.g. Five Year Plans/collectivisation) as well as foreign policy. An appreciation of the purpose and impact of the Nazi-Soviet Pact is to be expected.

At Level 1, answers will be superficial, perhaps focusing narrowly and generally on the Pact only. By Level 2, information on the two prescribed ‘considerations’ will be given. At Level 3, there should be the beginnings of evaluation of success/failure, with a more balanced assessment emerging at Level 4. At this level, areas of overlap should also be identified. To reach Level 5, answers should show awareness of differing priorities at different times and reach an evaluation reflecting the complexity of the situation.

Question 4

Assess the effectiveness of economic planning in bringing about stability and progress in **either** Germany in the years 1933 to 1941 **or** Italy in the years 1922 to 1940.

(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers should identify factors which fall into economic stability and progress categories, and be aware of the changes in relative importance at different points in the development of economic planning in the chosen regime/prescribed period. Evidence of economic progress might take the form of statistics, perhaps broken down into consumer/production goods. On the social side, the standard of living (e.g. real wages, working conditions) is an aspect which merits consideration. The ideological dimension may be viewed as an aspect which has links to stability and/or progress, possibly in terms of the economic basis for an active foreign policy.

At Level 1, answers will be superficial, perhaps covering only part of the prescribed period and/or one aspect. By Level 2, information on more than one dimension (economic stability/progress) will be given. At Level 3, there should be the beginnings of judgement, with a more balanced assessment emerging at Level 4. At this level, areas of overlap should also be identified. To reach Level 5, answers should show awareness of differing priorities at different times and reach an evaluation reflecting the complexity of the situation.

Question 5

“Foreign policy was based on the desire to make a show of aggression rather than on any real racial or territorial needs.”

How far do you agree with this statement in relation to **either** Germany in the years 1933 to 1941 **or** Italy in the years 1922 to 1940? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers should identify factors which fall into at least two of the suggested bases, i.e. aggression, race and territory, and be aware of the changes in relative importance at different points in the development of foreign policy in the prescribed period/chosen regime. Evidence of foreign policy is to be found in underlying ideology as well as specific incidents, such as Anschluss or the invasions of Abyssinia. Racial and territorial aspects may be linked to *lebensraum* or empire-building, for example. The link between an expansionist policy and economic circumstances is a dimension, the significance of which varied from time to time, e.g. economic crisis in Germany by 1937/in Italy by 1935.

At Level 1 answers will be superficial, perhaps focusing narrowly on a certain episode or only one of the suggested bases. By Level 2, information on at least two aspects will be given. At Level 3, there should be the beginnings of judgement, with a more balanced assessment emerging at Level 4. At this level, areas of overlap should also be identified. To reach Level 5, answers should show awareness of differing priorities at different times and reach an evaluation reflecting the complexity of the situation.

Question 6

To what extent were economic and foreign policies inter-related in **any one** of the totalitarian regimes you have studied? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers should identify factors which fall into the two categories, and be aware of overlap and of the changes in relative importance at different points in the development of the chosen regime. Economic aspects should be supported by reference to statistics for targets and/or achievements, while foreign policy ought to encompass aims as well episodes. Structure may take the form of reference to aims, methods and achievements, e.g. 'catch up' with the West using Five Year Plans as a form of security (USSR); gear the economy for war using the Four Year Plan which made blitzkrieg possible/necessary (Germany); modernise through economic 'battles' to earn international credibility (Italy).

At Level 1, answers will be superficial, perhaps covering only one aspect. By Level 2 information on both aspects will be given. At Level 3 there should be the beginnings of judgement, with a more balanced assessment emerging at Level 4. At this level, areas of overlap should also be identified. To reach Level 5, answers should show awareness of differing priorities at different times and reach an evaluation reflection reflecting the complexity of the situation.

Alternative J: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes, c1848-1956**A2 Unit 6: The Holocaust, 1938-45****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

How valid is Cesarani's interpretation of the implementation of the Final Solution?
(10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge. **3-5**
- L3: As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial. **6-8**
- L4: Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. **9-10**

Indicative content

At Level 1 the candidate identifies the view in the source that ideology was a key factor. To reach Level 2 the explanation will be more detailed using the material in the extract and from own knowledge, e.g. the emphasis on ideology and army –*Einsatzgruppen* co-operation (source) as against the practical demands imposed by/opportunities arising from war with Russia (knowledge). At Level 3, answers will assess the situation more critically, showing awareness that there is a debate between the intentionalists, who find the ideological imperatives more convincing, and the structuralists, who underline the impact of immediate circumstances. At Level 4, answers will show awareness of a range of views along the ideology-pragmatism spectrum.

- (b) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

How reliable is Hitler's speech to the Reichstag as evidence of his genocidal intentions in 1939?
(10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. **3-5**

- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. **9-10**

Indicative content

Level 1 answers will make simple statements related to the content of the extract, e.g. ‘menacing’ tone, ‘annihilation’. Level 2 responses will note the nature of the statement and the deficiencies of the extract, e.g. link between Bolshevism and Jews but generalised reference to ‘intentions’. To reach Level 3, answers will consider not just content but also the presentation of the information which might suggest bias on the part of the author, e.g. Reichstag audience in January 1939 so not directly linked to preparations for blitzkrieg on Poland or anti-semitic methods. Responses at Level 4 will be distinguished by their ability to form judgements on the bases of content/argument/style, e.g. extract is reliable as evidence of Hitler’s broad racial views, especially in respect of the Jews, but gives no evidence of any specific change in intention/policy in 1939, and is therefore reliable to a limited extent. The context requirements of Levels 2 – 4 demand ‘own knowledge’ which will most likely be used to support the reliability of the extract’s anti-semitic statements.

- (c) Use **Sources A, B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

“A variety of practical circumstances faced by the Nazi regime resulted in the transformation of anti-semitism into attempted genocide.”

Assess the validity of this view in relation to the years 1938 to 1944. *(20 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

Source A refers mainly to ideology as the key factor though it talks of co-operation ‘in the field’. Source B similarly relates to underlying anti-semitic forces but in the context of the outbreak of war. Source C covers the themes of evolution, opportunism, and structural limits. Other knowledge should link practicality to ideology in terms of the intentionalist/structuralist debate, offering some evaluation of their relative merits. Answers at Level 1 are likely to do little more than repeat the contents of the sources. At Level 2 the argument will be for or against the proposition but with limited information/arguments drawn largely either from the sources or own knowledge. By Level 3, there will be an attempt to present evidence both for and against making some reference to specific interpretations. Level 4 needs a clear attempt to synthesise and evaluate the evidence of the sources and own knowledge, although judgement may be confined to the conclusion. For Level 5 the argument will be well sustained on the basis of a wide range of evidence, effectively analysed and evaluated and arriving at a logical conclusion.