



General Certificate of Education

History 5041/6041

*Alternative J Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes,
c1848–c1956*

Mark Scheme

2005 examination – June series

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.

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.

June 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 “splits” in the context of the struggle for power between Stalin and Trotsky in the mid-1920s. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. the importance of unity in Stalin’s Party. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. Stalin used Lenin’s ban on factionalism from the 1921 Party Congress to expel Trotsky and his allies from the Party 1927. This might include understanding of issues that split the two men such as Socialism in One Country and World Revolution. **2-3**

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

Explain how the reasons supporting the need for strong government given in **Source A** differ from those given 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 “end in failure”, Source B to “confusion of party political interests”, Source C to “a sign of decay”. **1-2**
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. all sources refer to strong government: Source A: “Our Party is strong”, Source B: “The National Government will bring back racial and political unity”, Source C: “the strength of the nation”. There are differences in the reasons given for strong government, e.g. A refers to ideological divisions within the Bolshevik Party “permanent revolution” with implied link to Socialism in One
-

Country; while B presses the need to reverse “misery of our people” with stated national or racial ideas; and C presses empire-building. **3-5**

- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. sees differences reflecting the reasons for strong government, possibly showing awareness of the different context of each source, Source A refers to “Trotskyism” as part of the post-Lenin struggle for power presenting Trotsky as anti-Lenin and leading the country to “failure”, Source B to the communist threat and challenge to the Nazis from KPD “Communist madness” and Source C to “total power to the State” rather than the “democratic majority”. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of discrediting the ideas of political opponents in relation to other factors, in the coming to power of the totalitarian dictators you have studied.

You should refer in your answer to the USSR 1918–1929 and to **either** Germany 1918–1934 **or** Italy 1918–1929. **(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: e.g. all the sources discredit political opponents' ideas. Source A uses phrases to criticise Trotskyism, e.g. "would inevitably end in failure" and "playing at the seizure of power". As in Source B, Hitler says "confusion of party political interests and ideological conflict" again stressing the anti-democratic nature of Nazism discrediting the democratic Weimar Republic. Source C criticises the war record of the Liberal governments as Fascism "does not believe in perpetual peace", is "the complete opposite of socialism" and "does not believe the democratic majority".

This may be extended with some references to reasons for supporting the ideas of totalitarian dictatorships. In Source A "Our Party is strong"; in Source B "to bring back racial and political unity, and restore economic strength" and in Source C "the growth of empire" and "total power to the State". These might be developed with reference to own knowledge, e.g. Volksgemeinschaft, Mare Nostrum, Corporative State.

From own knowledge: e.g. constructs a balanced answer considering other factors that also explain the coming to power of totalitarian dictatorships.

- This might include reference to actual leader and how he build his own power base: the cult of the leader and Führerprinzip.
- The mistakes made by the other leader 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 may be a focus on the importance of propaganda and/or the use of terror to bring the regimes to power.

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

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited range of unconnected points about the discrediting of political opponents' ideas or the coming to power of the dictatorships; there will be greater range and selection of factors at 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 discrediting of political opponents' ideas (negative ideology) was important given the diverse pattern of support and/or the ideological background of the leader, but the coming to power of the regimes was due to other factors beside this discrediting. Answers may conclude discrediting political opponents' ideas was more important for one dictatorship under consideration than the other. Level 5 answers will engage in debate, cross-referencing sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the relationship between the discrediting of the political opponents' ideas and other factors in the coming of power of totalitarian dictatorships.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “Socialist Realism” in relation to Stalin’s use of propaganda in the 1930s. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. art that served the needs of the nation by encouraging the people to work hard. **1**

- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. art that presented each Soviet citizen as working selflessly to build socialism and being a model citizen. It is linked to the creation of the Union of Soviet Writers in 1932. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why propaganda was important in the USSR in the years 1929 to 1939. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. general understanding of the power of propaganda in the USSR possibly referring to “national unity”. **1-2**

- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. understands the need for unity in the years 1929-1939 – the requirements of the Party leadership, to promote collectivisation, Stakhanovite movement. There should be a clear focus on the importance of propaganda. **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. shows awareness of the increasingly tight control exercised by the Party over all aspects of propaganda as the decade progressed to present the show trials and build anti-Fascist awareness. **6-7**

- (c) “Propaganda successfully united the nation.”
With reference to the USSR in the years 1929 to 1939, 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 will need to show some understanding of the role of propaganda in uniting the nation. It had success particularly when it built on pre-existing trends and themes, and when directed at youth. Stalin's personal popularity was effectively developed. Stalin was aided by the relative naivety of the population.

Answers should balance the positive impact on unity with evidence of lack of success.

- It was made more difficult by their remoteness and poor literacy.
- Not all sections of society followed the Party line. Sections of the rural population that had suffered under collectivisation and famine remained hostile to the Party.
- Sub-cultures and counter-cultures developed, e.g. the return to traditional folk culture at the end of the 1930s.
- The need for gulags to contain known opponents.

Propaganda is only one factor helping to unite the nation. Answers should examine other factors, e.g. the use of terror, economic recovery, one-party state. The balance between the other factors and propaganda is up to the candidate, but there should be at least one good paragraph on each issue. Some answers, possibly very good ones, may debate how united the nation actually was.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and may only generalise on evidence of the effectiveness of propaganda in uniting the nation. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive of relevant examples. By Level 3, answers will identify particular ways the regime was united by propaganda, and will 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 and considering a range of factors that united/did not unite the nation. Level 5 answers will draw conclusions based soundly on the precise and wide-ranging evidence presented, and on a conceptual understanding of the role of propaganda and its links to other factors, as well as some evaluation of its power to unify the nation.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “the cult of the leader” in relation to **either** Hitler’s Germany after 1933 **or** Mussolini’s Italy after 1925. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the propaganda image of the leader – **either** Führer **or** Il Duce. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. both Hitler and Mussolini presented themselves as all-powerful figures, charismatic leaders bearing the will of the state. Their image-makers made them look more than mortal, partly through methods listed in the source. 2-3

- (b) Explain why propaganda was important in **either** Germany 1933–1939 **or** Italy 1925–1939. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. general comments on the role of propaganda within the regimes possibly referring to “impress and indoctrinate”. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. understands the need to impress and indoctrinate **either** to develop a strong racial Volk **or** build a nation of Fascists. There should be a clear focus on the importance of propaganda. 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. shows awareness of changing propaganda over the period with new issues ‘Berlin Olympic Games/Abyssinia’ or new technology like radio. 6-7

- (c) “Propaganda successfully united the nation.”
With reference to **either** Germany 1933–1939 **or** to Italy 1929–1939, 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 will need to show some understanding of the role of propaganda in uniting the nation. Both Hitler and Mussolini had experience in developing propaganda – Hitler in the Nazi Party and Mussolini as journalist. Their personal popularity was enhanced effectively before the impact of World War. Both regimes used propaganda to persuade the people to believe in the leader, to work as one strong nation, and to become more militaristic. Propaganda subverted the individual to the needs of the united nation. There are many examples of the techniques used by each regime.

Answers should balance the positive impact on unity with evidence of lack of success. There are many examples in both regimes of propaganda image not living up to reality and so not uniting the nation. In Italy there was growing opposition to Mussolini's anti-Semitic policies and closer links to Nazi Germany. Hitler faced opposition from the army and non-cooperation from youth. Both regimes were opposed by the church and socialist political parties. Answers may well consider the problems of evidence about non-conformity in a totalitarian regime, and the difficulties for historians in isolating the impact of propaganda on the unity of the nation.

Propaganda is only one factor helping to unite the nation. Answers should examine other factors, e.g. the use of terror, economic recovery, one-party state. The balance between the other factors and propaganda is up to the candidate, but there should be at least one good paragraph on each issue. Some answers, possibly very good ones, may debate how united the nation actually was.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and may only generalise on evidence of the effectiveness of propaganda in unity the nation. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive of relevant examples. By Level 3, answers will identify particular ways the regime was united by propaganda, and will 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 and consider a range of factors that united/did not unite the nation. Level 5 answers will draw conclusions soundly based on the precise and wide-ranging evidence presented, and on a conceptual understanding of the role of propaganda and its links to other factors, as well as some evaluation of its power to unify the nation.

June 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 **C** and your own knowledge.

How useful are **Sources B** and **C** in explaining the role of conflict in totalitarian ideologies? (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 sources and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

Level 1 answers might note that Source B does not say anything directly about ‘conflict’ whereas Source C is full of references such as ‘fight’. At Level 2 the assessment will be more detailed, e.g. Source B on ‘Bolshevik menace’, Source C on the split in society which will end in the ‘death’ of the bourgeoisie. By Level 3 answers will draw conclusions on utility, e.g. Source B identifies the enemy but implies the response (‘intervention’); Source C is central to the Marxist view of class struggle but is (therefore) sweeping (‘society’). Level 4 answers will expand on the evaluation of Source B and C to reach a conclusion, e.g. Hitler’s pragmatism in war context (Source B), Marx’s ideology in predicting the general course of events (Source C).

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

“The dictators’ emphasis on conflict and antagonism developed from the ideas of the nineteenth century.”
Assess this view with reference to the totalitarian regimes you have studied.

(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 'totalitarian' ideology, and the extent to which these factors varied over time. Source A refers to anti-individualism and may be linked to evidence of conformity based on Social Darwinism or militarism. For example, Source B, a speech made in the period of German attacks in the USSR, talks of the 'Bolshevik menace', to which Hitler had often referred from *Mein Kampf* onwards. Source C is a central Marxist statement of conflict, though whether it provided the basis for the Stalinist variant is debatable, especially in view of evidence such as Source D, which indicates Stalin's intolerance of theory.

Level 1 – focus on one aspect in a limited time-scale; Level 2 – uses several sources in a brief survey recognising change and issues connected with the specified factors; Level 3 – more comprehensive grasp of issues, more balanced use of sources/own knowledge, greater appreciation of time-scale; Level 4 – thorough understanding of change and continuity with conclusions based on sources and own knowledge; Level 5 – secure judgement based on understanding of 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

“Stalin’s policies for the development of Soviet industry and agriculture achieved only limited success.”

With reference to 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

Answers should assess the success of collectivisation and industrialisation, considering both evidence of success and failure of both parts of the economy for balance at Level 3 and beyond.

Limited success in agriculture may include the collectivisation of 90% of land by 1936 and the increase in grain procurements, which doubled between 1928 and 1933, tempered by the fall in production to less than 1928 levels from 1929 to 1934, the economic impact of dekulakisation and the terror famine, with reference to the Ukraine, cannibalism, the forced vegetarian diet and the social impact on the countryside.

Limited success in industry may include reference to the modest increases in production, that almost exclusively failed to meet the targets of the First Five Year Plan, the gross inefficiencies of the command economy, the development of class A industry but not consumer goods, even when the stated intention of the Second Five Year Plan was to provide consumer goods, and the limited success of the Third Five Year Plan in preparing for war because the plan was terminated early because of Operation Barbarossa.

However, there may be strong evidence deployed to argue for extensive, rather than limited success. Production increased massively – coal production reached 150 million tonnes by 1940 against 34.3 in 1928. Prestige projects were completed, like the Moscow Underground, the import of machine tools all but ended and Soviet industry provided the USSR with the worlds largest air force on the eve of war.

Answers at Level 1 will offer general statements about production growing, or peasants suffering.

At Level 2 answers may describe the Five Year Plans with some detail, or cover only success or failure, or only industry or agriculture and therefore lack balance.

At Level 3 answers will demonstrate weight and balance, by covering success and failure in relation to industry and agriculture. Evidence will be deployed to support the arguments, though judgement may be no more than recognising successes and failures.

Explicit judgement at Levels 4 and 5 may take the form of considering ‘limited’ success, pointing out that other methods may have been more successful; NEP could have been continued, or peasant farmers could have been given rat poison. Synoptic understanding at Level 4 and beyond may be demonstrated by considering the relative validity of the statement in relation to the two parts of economic development, with arguments that industrialisation

achieved great success at the expense of agriculture. Alternatively, the changing success of the economy during the period may be identified, with arguments considering the limited success of the First Five Year Plan, compared to the real developments of the Second Five Year Plan.

Question 3

How far do you agree that Stalin paid more attention to the practical than to the ideological aspects of Soviet foreign policy in the years 1929 to 1941?

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 these two categories, and be aware of overlap and of the change in relative importance of different points in the Litvinov and Molotov periods. Practical factors include the need to ‘catch up’ economically with the West and, especially after 1936, to prepare militarily and diplomatically for a potential attack. The ideological dimension is focused on the Stalinist variant of Marxist revolutionary goals, Socialism in One Country, placing security of the Soviet state as the basis for other revolutions. Alternatively there might be evidence of trying to spread world revolution, including aid to the Spanish Republic, the establishment of Communism in Poland (1939) and the Baltic States (1940). Synoptic understanding will suggest that the two aspects were inter-linked, e.g. the Nazi-Soviet Pact secured the Soviet state for a time but at the expense of ideological orthodoxy.

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.

Question 4

“The imposition of control was more important than the achievement of progress.”
How far do you agree with this view of economic policy in **either** Nazi Germany in the years 1933 to 1941 **or** Fascist 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 reflect balance in the course of evaluating the relative importance of control and progress at different points in the development of the regime considered. In Germany, during the pre-1936 Schacht period, there was an emphasis on economic balance, including control over the unemployment level, and consequent progress in productivity. Under Goering's Four Year Plan there was a clear push for rearmament even though the price was economic over-heating. In Italy, the 'battles' for the marshes, grain, births and the lire were, arguably, not so much matters of control as vehicles for the promotion of the regime, thus signifying a sort of progress. Appropriately synoptic responses will make explicit their awareness of military/political dimensions underlying economic policy.

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.

Question 5

“Ideology was more important than international circumstances in the development of foreign policy.”

Assess the validity of this view in relation to **either** Nazi Germany in the years 1933 to 1941 **or** Fascist 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 the two categories, ideology and circumstances, and be aware of overlap and of changes in relative importance at different points in the development of the chosen regime. 'Ideology' encompasses Nazi/Fascist dynamism, militarism, expansionism (Nazi lebensraum or Fascist imperialism), and Nazi racism. 'International circumstances' include the role of the League of Nations, appeasement, Soviet diplomacy and (eventually) armed opposition. Synoptic understanding will suggest that the two aspects were inter-linked, e.g. aggressive exploitation of attempts at collective security.

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 and evaluation reflecting the complexity of the situation.

Question 6

“Foreign policy was devised according to economic needs.”

Assess the validity of this view in relation to **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 link aims in foreign policy to the extent of their derivation from economic considerations. At the higher levels there will be an awareness of overlap and of the changes in motives at different points in the development of the chosen regime. For Stalin, the emphasis on security remained the priority, despite the apparent ‘zig-zags’ in foreign policy; for Hitler the change of emphasis from stability (1933-6) to remilitarisation (1936-9) to blitzkrieg (1939-40) suggests that the economy was prioritised, then exploited, so that military tactics were adopted partly to redress the consequent ‘overheating’; and for Mussolini, considerations of prestige seemed to predominate in both foreign and economic spheres, indicating, perhaps, that neither depended primarily on the other.

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.

June 2005

Alternative J: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes, c1848-c1956

A2 Unit 6: The Holocaust, 1938–1945

Question 1

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

Assess the validity of the interpretation expressed in **Source A** about the effects of Kristallnacht. (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

Dawidowicz argues that Kristallnacht provided the opportunity to completely remove the freedom of German Jews and that within three days Goering chaired a meeting where, on the orders of Hitler, the Jewish question was to be answered. A Level 1 answer would identify the interpretation, though there may be confusion, with the reference to solving the question ‘one way or another’ being erroneously confused with the Final Solution.

For Level 2 own knowledge is required to expand on the interpretation. The result of the meeting was the Decree Excluding Jews from German Economic Life, which formalised the transfer of Jewish factories and companies to Aryans and excluded Jews from all commercial life. As such, Kristallnacht was the beginning of the exclusion of Jews from German society, and the end of the policy of marginalising them.

However, evaluation of these arguments should be made for Level 3 and above. The intentionalist analysis would not see Kristallnacht as an ‘opportunity’ to move against the Jewish community; rather it was part of a series of deliberate steps that marginalised, excluded and ultimately exterminated the Jewish community in Germany and continental Europe. The structuralist analysis would stress that Kristallnacht provided just such an opportunity. Goering was empowered by Hitler, who did not know what he wanted, evidenced by the fact that far from solving the Jewish question one way or another, the meeting promulgated laws that attacked Jews’ freedoms, but it would be another three years and take the dislocation of war to move Nazi policy towards the ultimate and final solution.

Level 4 answers would offer a sustained judgement, perhaps recognising that Dawidowicz is actually an intentionalist and that her argument relates to the steps towards the holocaust, or that Kristallnacht was hardly part of a plan, given its origins (Goering had lost control of the budget and needed the wealth of the Jewish community, Goebbels needed to regain Hitler's favour following his affair with a Czech actress).

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

How useful is the sergeant's letter as evidence of the reaction of the German people to the destruction of the Warsaw ghetto? (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

The source is useful because of its provenance, content, purpose and reliability. The source was written by an eye-witness, who clearly was proud of the destruction of the ghetto ('Our folks did a really fantastic job'), with the implication that this was a normal reaction. Furthermore, the letter was sent to the sergeant's former place of work. Answers should appreciate that this would not be allowed unless the German people were likely to approve of the actions. As the letter refers to an incident that it might be thought would be shameful, yet the sergeant felt no need to hide his pride in destroying all the houses in the ghetto, it might also be considered reliable, and therefore useful to the historian studying the reaction of the German people.

To reach Level 3 answers will need to consider the weaknesses of the source as evidence of the reaction of the German people to the destruction of the Warsaw ghetto. The source tells us what the sergeant felt, but not explicitly how those in the factory where he used to work felt about the incident. Reference to Goldhagen's particular views may also be made – his thesis (one of the specified texts) stressed the complicity of ordinary Germans by implication, as in this particular source.

Judgement might take the form of arguing that Goldhagen's particular thesis has led him to present the evidence in a particular way. His choice of language ('proudly wrote') is not necessarily supported by the text; nor indeed is his conclusion that the sergeant was arguing the destruction was a 'great national achievement'.

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

“The pursuit of Lebensraum was more important than the achievement of genocide for the Nazi regime in the years 1939 to 1945.”

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 wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

The question requires candidates to consider the relative importance of two Nazi ideological aims, Lebensraum and genocide. Answers should be able to place these factors within the wider intentionalist/structuralist debate about the origins and development of Nazi anti-Semitic policy, which all the specified sources consider.

Hitler's desire for Lebensraum might be supported by reference to the *25 Point Programme*, *Mein Kampf*, the invasion of Poland, the creation of the General Government after the conquest, with the transfer of farming land from Poles to Germans, and finally *Barbarossa*, with Hitler's success in conquering the Ukrainian bread-basket and his refusal to allow any form of Ukrainian independence that would deprive Germans of living space. Understanding that the invasion of the USSR was driven by geo-political motives could be linked to the structuralist argument (which Farmer tentatively supports), which would deny any planned Holocaust and therefore not see it as the primary policy. The development of the Holocaust would be linked to the failure to conquer the USSR and transfer the ghettoised Jews to

Siberia. Source B's reference to the destruction of the Warsaw ghetto in 1943 could be seen as necessary now that the invasion of the USSR had ground to a halt (Hitler had already made enquiries about peace).

Balance for Level 3 and beyond could take the form of arguing that genocide was more important than Lebensraum. Commitment to genocide can also be at least inferred from *Mein Kampf*, anti-Semitic propaganda after 1933, and the increasingly discriminatory measures of the years before 1939 (which Source A supports), becoming a more explicit aim in the speeches of Hitler in 1939 (warning the Jews of their fate if they caused another war) and 1941 (Garden of Eden). Source C can be used as evidence of Hitler's intentions, with his orders for the elimination of the Bolshevik/Jewish intelligentsia. Goldhagen supports this view, stressing the link in all Germans minds that Source C refers to, the hatred of Bolshevism and Judaism.

The sources may be used to support independent judgement, perhaps that the destruction of the Warsaw ghetto (Source B) in June 1943 shows genocide was more important than Lebensraum, as resources were used in Warsaw that would have been better deployed in the Battle of Kursk (beginning on 5th July 1943) in which victory may have secured Lebensraum. Alternatively, Source C may be used to illustrate that in Hitler's mind Jewish-Bolshevism was intrinsically merged and therefore, defeat of the USSR would mean that the two goals could both be achieved, the sort of synthesis of arguments that Kershaw has made.