

GCE 2005  
*January Series*



## Mark Scheme

### History Alternative J Units 1 and 4 *(Subject Code 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 to download from the AQA Website:  
[www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2005 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.

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 undiscriminating 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 undiscriminating 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 AO1.1, 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 (AO1.2), 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 (AO2, 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 characteristics: 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.

**January 2005****Alternative J: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes, c1848-c1956****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 importance of “dictatorship of the proletariat” in the context of Lenin’s ideas on leadership. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. workers were to seize control. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. Lenin had redefined Marx’s original idea. He now believed the Party had the knowledge and authority to run economic affairs. **2-3**

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

Explain how Stalin’s aims in **Source A** differ from those given by the political leader 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 “to keep the unity of our Party”, Source B to “to restore to the German people unity of mind and will”, Source C to “to defend and enforce the Blackshirts’ revolution”. **1-2**
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. all sources refer to unity: Source A; “the union of workers and peasants”, Source B; “racial and political unity”, Source C; “coalition government to rally all”. There are differences, e.g. A stresses the workers while B and C have a strong nationalist line. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. sees similarities and differences reflecting the leader's political origins, but also shows awareness of the context of each source, each man is building his dictatorship: A refers to "Comrade Lenin" as part of Stalin's bid for power, B to "National Government" as the NSDAP is part of a coalition government, and C to "Blackshirts' revolution" though Mussolini still shares power. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of the role of the leader, in relation to other factors, in the coming to power of the dictatorships you have studied.

You should refer to your answer to the USSR in the years 1924 to 1929 and **either** Germany in the years 1928 to 1933 **or** Italy in the years 1918 to 1922. *(15 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and undiscriminating, 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: e.g. all the sources stress the importance of the individual in leading the country. Source A uses phrases, e.g. “ordered us”, “all our might” and “We swear” suggesting the Bolshevik party but this is part of Stalin’s personal bid for power. As in Source B, Hitler uses “it will”, “we are” and “we must overcome” again suggesting the coalition government, but underlying each phrase is Hitler’s plan for dictatorship. Source C is more direct “I am here”, “I could have” and “I have formed”. Good answers may well consider different aspects of leadership, demonstrated by each man, to develop the answer.

From own knowledge: e.g. constructs a balanced answer considering other factors that also explain the accession to power of dictatorships. This might include reference to mistakes made by the other leading politicians: in the USSR, Trotsky and the rest of the Politburo; in Germany, Hindenburg and Papen; in Italy, the King, Giolitti and the Pope. Economic conditions may offer an alternative explanation: in the USSR, the impact of the Civil War and the subsequent division over NEP; in Germany, the impact of the Depression after 1929; in Italy, the post-War economic crisis and the growth of socialism. There should be at least one good paragraph on the actual leader and how he built his own power base as the foundation of dictatorship: the cult of the leader and Führerprinzip.

Answers on the USSR might focus on the development of dictatorship under Lenin or Stalin, or might refer to both.

Answers, particularly good ones, on Germany and Italy may contest the extent of dictatorship by 1933/1928. They should be credited provided it is linked to the role of the leader.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited range of unconnected points about the leaders; there will be greater range and selection of factors of Level 2. Candidates who make no reference to the sources cannot score higher than Level 2. Level 3 answers will have greater accuracy, range and depth and will make some links to the “importance” of the factors identified, although this will not necessarily be sustained or may lack depth of understanding. By Level 4 the case will be argued more strongly, possibly arguing that the leader’s ideas and personality were vitally important but their success in achieving dictatorship was dependent on others’ mistakes and events beyond their immediate control. Level 5 answers will engage in debate, cross-referencing sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the relationship between the leader and other factors in the development of totalitarian rule.

## Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “only real rival” in relation to Stalin’s hold on power in the USSR by 1934. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. no other politician who could challenge Stalin’s control of the Party. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. understanding that some earlier rivals had been sidelined/exiled and did not have a political platform to mount

an effective challenge; but Kirov was popular, e.g. his speech to Congress January 1934 was received enthusiastically. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the great purges took place in the years 1936 to 1939. *(7 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he needed to remove his rivals especially Trotskyites. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. shows understanding that there are different explanations. Stalin faced growing opposition especially to collectivisation. The purges happened as local officials' reaction to events rather than as a prepared programme. **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. is able to see the purges as a response to growing security threats, internally and externally. **6-7**

- (c) "After 1934, Stalin's dictatorship was complete."  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement with reference to the years 1929 to 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. **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**

By the end of 1934 there is evidence the dictatorship was complete:

- the removal of opposition: the Ryutinites; purges of local party branches; the removal of economic opposition, e.g. kulaks, industrial saboteurs; OGPU merged into the NKVD; Gulags; Kirov;
- other factors before 1934 that suggest the dictatorship was complete: e.g. the removal of the other members of the original Politburo by 1929; the development of the cult of the leader; education and youth policies.

This needs to be balanced with understanding that by 1934 he still faced challenges:

- Kamenev, Zinoviev and Bukharin were still at large;
- opposition to collectivisation persisted;
- after 1934 he extended the repression, e.g. the show trials; Ezhovchina; arrest and execution of Kamenev, Zinoviev etc;
- he needed to continue to complete the dictatorship, e.g. 1936 Constitution; continued propaganda, radios and cinema; socialist realism in art and literature.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and may only generalise on evidence of the completeness of Stalin's dictatorship. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive of relevant examples. By Level 3, answers will identify particular ways the dictatorship was complete/incomplete after 1934, especially the use of repression, and may begin to develop a counter-argument. By Level 4 the analysis will be balanced and broad, paying attention to the whole time period in the question 1929-1939. Level 5 answers will draw conclusions based soundly on the precise and wide-ranging evidence presented, and on a conceptual understanding of the nature of Stalin's dictatorship.

**Question 3**

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by "uncompromising demands" in relation to Hitler's position in the Reichstag after the July 1932 election. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. Hitler was not prepared to accept anything less than Chancellor. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Hitler as leader of the largest party wanted to hold out for position of Chancellor with a Nazi cabinet and was not prepared to accept the offered vice-Chancellorship. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Hindenburg refused to appoint Hitler as Chancellor in July 1932. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Hindenburg did not like/trust the Bohemian corporal. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the Nazi party was divided and the SA was unruly, and Hindenburg preferred to look for an alternative, e.g. Franz von Papen. **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. explains President Hindenburg's central role in the appointment, was being advised by powerful anti-Hitler interests among the elites. **6-7**

(c) "Hitler had achieved complete power by the end of 1934."  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement with reference to Germany in the years 1933 to 1938. **(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 should identify actions taken by the end of 1934 to establish Hitler's power:

- implications of the death of Hindenburg and the subsequent army oath;
- broader issues, e.g. the Enabling Act;
- Gleichschaltung: action against all other political parties; control of the legal system, civil service and media; removal of political opposition outside and within the Nazi Party;
- power based on divide and rule (master in the Third Reich?);
- SA, and the first concentration camps.

The answer should have some balance with reference to aspects of life that remained unconsolidated and where Hitler's power was not complete:

- the army, taking the date to 1938 gives the chance to deal with Fritsch and Blomberg;
- the answer may well consider the problems of evidence when assessing the completeness of Hitler's power, e.g. passive opposition, church resistance, non-compliance with Nazi expectations;
- conflict between Nazi and inherited government systems led to administrative chaos that arguably undermined Hitler's power (weak dictator);
- dependence on terror suggests power was not complete.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and may only generalise on evidence of completeness of power. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive of relevant examples. By Level 3, answers will identify particular ways the power was established, and may begin to develop a counter-argument. By Level 4 the analysis will be balanced and broad paying attention to the whole time period in the question. Level 5 answers will draw conclusions soundly based on the precise and wide-ranging evidence presented, and on a conceptual understanding of the nature of Hitler's power.

#### Question 4

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by "potentially weak" in relation to Mussolini's position in the Chamber of Deputies. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. Mussolini was the head of coalition government and could be dismissed. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. he was only one of 4 Fascists in the cabinet, and there were only 35 Fascists in the 535-member Chamber of Deputies having won 7% of the public vote. He was under pressure as well from the Fascists, as some were radical and others moderate. He was therefore potentially weak as he could be overruled. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why King Victor Emmanuel III appointed Mussolini as Prime Minister on 29 October 1922. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. the King had no confidence in Liberal politicians. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. followed advice given to him by Salandra to appoint Mussolini as PM after Salandra had failed to form a government. **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. in the face of Fascist insurrection the king refused to impose martial law. **6-7**

- (c) “Mussolini had achieved his dictatorship.”  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement with reference to Italy in the years 1929 to 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. **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**

This question invites candidates to examine the nature of Mussolini’s power across the period. Some may choose to pinpoint a year of most complete dictatorship, others may conclude he had to share power throughout the period. Any relevant response would be appropriate.

Answers should identify the restraints on Mussolini’s power as he always had to consider the monarchy:

- he was appointed by the King and monarchy persisted;
- army officers owed loyalty to the king;
- the traditional apparatus of status continued to run the country rather than the Fascist Party;
- he had to bear in mind other elites such as the industrialists, landowners and Catholic Church;
- opposition persisted, e.g. the role of Farinacci.

The answer should have some balance with reference to Mussolini's personal dictatorship:

- the cult of the Duce in promoting the Mussolini myth;
- the work of the OVRA (secret police);
- there was little effective opposition in Fascist Italy;
- he created Fascist institutions of government, e.g. the Fascist Grand Council.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and may only generalise on evidence of dictatorship. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive of relevant examples of his dictatorship. By Level 3, answers will identify particular ways the dictatorship was established, and may begin to develop a counter-argument. By Level 4 the analysis will be balanced and broad paying attention to the whole time period in the question. Level 5 answers will draw conclusions soundly based on the precise and wide-ranging evidence presented, and on a conceptual understanding of the nature of dictatorship.

**January 2005****Alternative J: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes, c1848-c1956****A2 Unit 4: Totalitarian Ideologies, Economic, Social and Foreign Policies, 1848-1956****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Sources B** and **D** and your own knowledge.

How fully do **Sources B** and **D** explain the ideological basis for the militarism of the regimes of Mussolini and Hitler? (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**

Responses should identify that Source B draws attention to the ‘powerful drives and impulses’ that extend beyond human reason. Nietzsche believed in the will to power, which was a key part of the ideological basis of Nazism, as part of Hitler’s belief in struggle and the survival of the fittest. Mussolini also believed in the innate primeval glory of warfare. Source D offers further ideological reasons for the militarism of Mussolini and Hitler’s regimes. The ‘menace of envious neighbours’ relates to Hitler’s racial world view, though has less relevance ideologically to Mussolini. The ‘battle of world views’ relates directly to the clash between Fascism and Nazism on the one hand and communism, whilst economic necessity relates to racial rights that Hitler justified Lebensraum with, and Mussolini to as lesser extent articulated over Abyssinia. National unity is also mentioned in Source D, and was a key motive behind militarism in Italy.

However, Nietzsche was misused by the Nazis – he was not an advocate of war. Furthermore, it might be argued that in Germany national unity was required to achieve militaristic ideological aims. Furthermore, ‘envious neighbours’ does not develop the racial nature of Nazi militarism, with the belief in the Herrenvolk, Untermenschen and Lebensraum. Both sources are therefore in totality not sufficient.

Conclusions might relate to the fuller nature of Source D than B, to the non-prescriptive intentions of Nietzsche compared to the hindsight of Kitchen, or to the general nature of the sources.

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

“Stalin’s ‘Socialism in One Country’ was a betrayal of the idea of international revolution, as expressed in the Communist Manifesto of 1848.”

Assess the validity of this view.

(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 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**

### **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 the range of factors which determined the development of Communist ideology, and the extent to which these factors varied over time. Source A refers to the support by Communists for ‘every revolutionary movement’, ‘everywhere’, providing

the ideological basis for Trotsky's espousal of 'permanent revolution'. Source C talks of the 'nationalistic' 'Socialism in One Country' defeating (Lenin's) 'internationalism'.

Own knowledge may be used to argue that Marx argued in favour of support for all communist revolutions. Socialism in One Country rejected this. It was meant to, as Stalin was trying to draw a distinction between himself and Trotsky. In focusing on developing socialism in the USSR, Stalin was betraying Marx's ideas therefore. Stalin's focus was on building up Soviet communism. A revolution in the countryside would create a rural proletariat, industrialisation would create a genuine proletariat, and the development of the military would enable Soviet communism to survive, by defending the state from the capitalist west. The focus on Russian heroes and Russia's past (e.g. Alexander Nevsky) was part of this ideology. For balance, stronger answers should consider that Stalin and his cronies did not believe they were betraying Marx. Marx had effectively been betrayed by the forced rather than spontaneous revolution of October 1917. Therefore a strong Soviet Union was necessary to allow the export of revolution. Judgement might involve pointing out that Trotsky also 'betrayed' the Communist Manifesto as he argued for permanent, forced revolution, whilst Marx believed in supporting revolutions once they spontaneously broke out. Reference to Stalin's downgrading of the role of the Comintern might be seen but its continued role might be linked to Stalin's attacks on social fascism, aid to the Spanish Republic and extension of socialism to the Baltic States (1939) and Eastern Europe (post-war).

At Level 1 the focus is likely to be on one particular aspect in a limited time-scale. At Level 2 the response should make use of both sources although not necessarily in depth and will identify some relevant issues and aspects of change. By Level 3 the grasp of 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 the sources and own knowledge. At Level 5 judgement will be securely based on a sound understanding of the impact of contextual factors on ideology 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**

How effective was Stalin's regime in directing and developing the Soviet economy 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 consider both synoptic factors (directing and developing), with synoptic understanding at Level 4 and beyond being demonstrated by an awareness of the inter-relationship between the two factors, the changing importance at various points in the period or the relative effectiveness of the two factors in comparison.

Effective direction of the economy might include reference to the creation of collective farms, both by persuasion through closing the markets, code 107 and seizures, plus the forcible collectivisation that resulted in 90% of land being collectivised by 1936, with

Machine Tractor Stations to control the collectives. Industry was effectively directed through GOSPLAN and the three Five Year Plans of this period, plus ferocious work discipline that made absenteeism a criminal offence. Effective development of the economy should include the success of the Second Plan, the ending of rationing of bread in 1935, prestige projects like the Moscow underground, production of sophisticated manufactured goods like machine tools and the creation of the world's largest air force by 1938.

However, a balanced answer would need discussion of the overall effectiveness of direction, with the shortage of equipment for various sectors of the economy, the execution of industrial experts and agricultural experts with dekulakisation. Ineffective development could consider the failures of the First Five Year Plan, the failure to produce consumer goods in the Second Five Year Plan, the famine in the Ukraine, the forced vegetarian diet of most Soviet Citizens and the futility of prestige projects like the White Sea Canal.

### Question 3

“Soviet foreign policy aims were fulfilled in relation to diplomacy and security in the years 1929 to 1941.”

Assess the validity of this view. (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

Diplomatic aims might include spreading communism, especially in the years 1929 to 1933 and after 1939. They also include the search for collective security under Litvinov (1930 to May 1939) and the need for a military alliance under Molotov (May 1939+). Security includes the desire for buffer zones, collective security and the need to prepare militarily for attack.

Diplomatically, there was some success in spreading communism, with the takeover of the Baltic States, eastern Poland and Bessarabia, though attacking Blum as a ‘social fascist’ hindered Franco-Soviet relations. The need for collective security seemed to have been fulfilled in 1934 when the USSR joined the League of Nations, and with the accession of Popular Fronts in Spain and France, plus the Franco-Czech-Soviet alliance of 1935. Munich and the collapse of Republican Spain make clear ultimate failure.

Security was achieved partially; victory over Finland in the winter war saw the USSR gain a buffer for Leningrad, and the acquisition of eastern Poland and the Baltic states would make any German attack much harder. Furthermore, the USSR avoided war for eighteen months. Against this must be considered the failure to achieve a military alliance with the British (if this was ever realistic) and the reliance on the Nazi-Soviet Pact which Stalin knew would not last, but he was still relying on in June 1941.

Synoptic understanding and judgment may be provided by considering the relative importance of the two aims where they came into conflict – for example Stalin fulfilled the

aim of security during the Spanish Civil War by prolonging the war with Soviet aid, but he also ensured there was no Communist victory in case this provoked a wider European conflict.

#### Question 4

“A response to economic circumstances rather than the product of ideology.”

How far do you agree with this statement about **either** the Nazi four-year plans **or** the Fascist corporative state? (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

##### Germany

Evidence that the creation of Goering's Four Year Plan Office was an ideological creation might include the fact that it was created to provide a Nazi alternative to the Economics Ministry under Schacht, giving power to an ideologically heavyweight Goering. The aims of the plan suggest ideology was followed in many cases. The agricultural sector was to be protected and developed as the source of self-sufficiency in a time of war, and ethnically as the most racially pure sector of the population. Jews and women should both be removed from the economy in favour of Aryan German males. The need for a war economy (*Wehrwirtschaft*) was outlined in the Four Year Plan. This would involve production for war and autarky.

However, Hitler's attitude towards economics was essentially pragmatic. The appointment of Goering was as much about politics as economics. Hitler argued that he placed orders for war materials, but who filled them was irrelevant to him. The Four Year Plan could only promote agriculture at the expense of industry and re-armament and so was increasingly ignored, the number of women employed increased to compensate for loss of men into the army.

The relative importance of different parts of ideology might be discussed to provide judgement or synoptic links, for example the overall aim of war was followed, but preparation for the war meant ideological compromises.

##### Italy

The Fascist corporative state was an ideological creation of Mussolini, developed to try and solve the problems created by liberal economics and socialist economics, in keeping with the Fascist aim of providing unity and harmony. As such, answers should argue for some ideological context for the state's creation. Mussolini certainly believed he had found a third way, with the corporate boards providing a forum for input from employers, employees and Fascist officials.



Balanced answers should be aware of the practical context though; the need for industrial harmony to replace the strikes and low-productivity that characterised the Italian economy, as well as the need for a visible sign of Government action to improve the Italian economy.

Lower level answers may simply describe the corporative state, referring to the seven sectors of the economy and the corporations that governed them. Synoptic understanding might be provided by exploring the links between the practical need for arbitration and state control of the economy, as allowed by the new ‘third way’.

### Question 5

To what extent was foreign policy developed from a clear set of political and economic aims by **either** Hitler in the years 1933 to 1941 **or** Mussolini 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

#### Germany

Aims can be seen clearly in the 25 point programme, Mein Kampf, the Secret Book and Hossbach. Reference might be seen to overturning the Treaty of Versailles (conscription and remilitarising the Rhineland), re-arming (conscription, airforce, Anglo-German Naval Agreement), uniting German speaking people (Anschluss and Munich) and *Lebensraum* (the invasions of Poland and specifically the USSR). Good answers may note the inter-connections between economic and political aims, for example *Lebensraum* with its goals of providing land for *Herrenvolk* Germans in the east at the expense of inferior Slavs. Weaker answers may fail to appreciate the two different synoptic elements and ignore them.

Balance should be provided by considering evidence that foreign policy did not develop from clear aims. Politically Hitler did deals with those he despised and wished to conquer (Poland 1934, USSR 1939) and went to war with a country he admired (Britain). He carried out the Anschluss only because his entry into Vienna was greeted so rapturously. Economically, Hitler never really had aims – the economy was to provide for war. It might be noted that the weakness of the economy gave foreign policy its own dynamic, rather than clear aims, for example the need to fight wars of conquest to maintain the German economy.

#### Italy

Aims may be seen in Mussolini’s guiding statement that he sought to make Italy ‘great, respected and feared’ or in the militaristic nature of Fascism. Reference may be seen to the desire for an overseas Empire (Abyssinia and Albania before the Second World War, involvement on North Africa in 1940), the desire to dominate the Mediterranean Sea and the desire to destroy communism (Spanish Civil War). Good answers may note the inter-connections between economic and political aims, for example the economic benefits of

imperialism, as well as the desire to make Rome the capital of a new Empire. Weaker answers may fail to appreciate the two different synoptic elements and ignore them.

Balance should be provided by considering evidence that foreign policy did not develop from clear aims. Mussolini opposed Hitler as a threat to his ally Austria and prevented the Anschluss in 1934; by 1938 he was an ally of Hitler and stepped aside. He sought peace in the 1920s, playing key roles at Locarno and signing the Kellogg-Briand Pact; despite his aggression in the 1930s he also tried to broker peace at Munich and successfully had Italy exempted from the terms of the Pact of Steel when Hitler invaded Poland. Economically, Mussolini had few aims that translated themselves into a clear foreign policy – the need for natural resources was an excuse for the Abyssinian adventure, and economic control of Albania made invasion irrelevant. Judgement might involve pointing out that political aims were of greater importance than economic.

### Question 6

How far did the achievement of foreign policy aims depend on the strength of the economy 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 each of the categories, foreign and economic, and be aware of overlap and of the changes in relative significance at different points in the development of the chosen regime. The achievement of foreign policy aims is debatable in itself, but depended on a range of variables, including economic levels, though it could be argued that the ideological imperative remained fixed. In Stalin's USSR, relative backwardness may have necessitated the pursuit of collective security by Litvinov and of the Nazi-Soviet Pact by Molotov. The consolidation of Socialism In One Country went hand-in-hand with both industrialisation and diplomacy. In Nazi Germany, the first economic phase of recovery was surely an essential base for the shift from 'butter' to 'guns'. It is possible, however, that moves towards Lebensraum were made through blitzkrieg campaigns launched to counteract economic weakness, rather than to capitalise on economic stability. In Fascist Italy, some territorial expansion and prestige were achieved, e.g. Abyssinia (1936), Quota 90 (1927), with apparent disregard for their economic basis or impact.

Level 1 – superficial, perhaps only covering one aspect; Level 2 – provides information on the two aspects; Level 3 – begins to show judgement; Level 4 – more balanced assessment, identifying areas of overlap; Level 5 – awareness of differing priorities at different times, reaching an evaluation reflecting the complexity of the situation.