



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative E Unit 4

Mark Scheme

2007 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.

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

Copyright © 2007 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.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's 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 specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by A2 level candidates for a number of years.

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

The 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 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 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.

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) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

B: 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.

C: 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 2007

Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825-1941

A2 Unit 4: Germany, Russia and the Soviet Union in the 19th and 20th Centuries

Section A: Autocracy and Reform in Germany and Russia, 1825-1939

Question 1

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

How fully do these two sources explain the degree of political stability in Russia and Germany after the abdication of their monarchs? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 might provide a limited summary of the sources in broad and general terms, presenting some evidence of political stability. Responses at Level 2 may also be source-led and may still be restricted to a general context, with only limited supporting own knowledge to develop the precise contexts, and limited development in terms of 'how fully'. The prospects of political stability for the Provisional Government in Russia seemed high, with the Tsar's appeal for loyalty and the allegiance of the whole country, including the nobility, the military leaders and, significantly, the apparent support of the Petrograd Soviet. There was also the appearance of political stability in Weimar Germany, with the army's support to maintain law and order, the deal between workers and employers and Ebert successfully avoiding extremist revolution. Both a range of knowledge and some signs of balanced evaluation should be explicit at Level 3, with some conclusions reached in terms of 'how fully'. In Russia, the initial honeymoon period of post-revolutionary euphoria disguised a range of political, economic and military problems which remained unsolved. 'Order No. 1', passed immediately by the Petrograd Soviet, challenged the legitimacy of the non-elected Provisional Government and undermined the chances of political stability (as source references to "would later claim" and "subverting" imply). A similar mirage was evident in Germany, as a pragmatic Ebert led a moderate reformist SPD government caught between the extreme left and the conservative right, as political unrest spread especially in Berlin and Bavaria. His collaboration with the right did contain this political instability but ensured that the old elites remained in power and that Germany's socialist movement remained permanently split. Far from being "a near heroic figure", Ebert's failure to rid himself of the

influence of the powerful conservative elites undermined loyalty towards the Weimar regime, and promoted divisions in German society. At this level, candidates must show some explicit insight beyond source content, but coverage will be 'thin' for both sources, or developed for one. Answers at Level 4 should be as above for Level 3 but with a developed insight for both sources, perhaps recognising the initial appearance of political stability in both states following the abdication of the monarchy, but also appreciating the broader contexts and presenting a balanced and developed evaluation.

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

'Without popular support, reform movements were unable to achieve significant change.'

Assess the validity of this view with reference to **both** Russia **and** Germany during the period 1825 to 1939. (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.

Candidates will not be expected to demonstrate knowledge of the whole period in the same depth, but should be able to distinguish between the different social and political contexts and select evidence over the period about the success of reform movements in these states. Responses should achieve some element of balance in terms of coverage and use of own knowledge/sources, and show some appreciation of the changes and developments over the period in relation to the question.

There are several themes for candidates to consider: not only whether reform movements failed to achieve significant change (this should certainly be challenged), but also to assess the reasons for this degree or lack of success – was the question of popular support the central issue or were other factors important too?

The backward nature of 19th century tsarist Russia restricted the development of reform movements – the state was largely comprised of illiterate peasants who were conditioned to accept and support the tsarist regime. Source B confirms the hostility shown towards the Populist movement in the 1870s which failed to achieve any significant change. Economic rather than political factors triggered sporadic protests, and political parties remained illegal up to 1905. The 1905 Revolution was spontaneous, almost accidental, with little leadership or co-ordination, and the liberals, afraid of violence, did not mix well with the workers. Popular protests in 1917 helped to produce a short-lived Provisional Government which, Source C suggests, was both welcomed and supported by the Russian people. However, the lack of reforms and the demands of a debilitating war led to a Bolshevik dictatorship which claimed power in the name of the people. Clearly, the parliamentary experiment of the Dumas after 1905 and the two Revolutions of 1917 represented very significant change in Russia brought about by reform movements.

For Germany, Source A provides evidence of social differences and divisions (with some clear parallels with Russia in 1905) to explain the failure of the 1848 Revolution, suggesting that the liberals feared popular support and failed to harness this to the reform movement. During the Second Reich, a combination of elitist dominance and political expediency within a sham constitution contained reform movements; yet, in relative terms, Germany was an advanced democracy with the world's first welfare state. The creation of the Weimar Republic, described in Source D, marked the most significant change for reform movements in Germany and seemed to promote a popular socialist democracy, but German society remained deeply divided and ultimately failed to secure the support of a people increasingly demoralised by defeat in war and economic turmoil. In both states, 20th century totalitarian regimes smothered any potential reform movements with propaganda and indoctrination, imposing popular conformity and highlighting apparent support.

Level 1 will only include a narrow range of evidence and will lack balance between the states (or only include one state), perhaps just briefly summarising the sources. Level 2 should provide signs of a better balance, but the review of the period will still be limited, presenting only a generalised focus in terms of the question and covering a restricted range of themes; the content might also be restricted to the contexts of the sources. By Level 3, both sources and own knowledge must be included, and there should be some clear signs of assessment in terms of 'significant change' and 'popular support', but this will not be balanced nor developed (comment may again be restricted to the source contexts), and there will only be limited appreciation of the changing contexts over the 100 years. More range, balance and development will all be evident at Level 4, with perhaps some insight into the differing demands of different social and political groups in both countries. Judgement and conclusions at Level 5 will reveal an effective overview, highlighting the key changes and turning points in both states.

Section B: European Dictatorships in the Inter-War Years

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 almost to 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

‘Debates about party policy were more important than personalities in deciding the outcome of the struggle for power in the USSR in the years 1924 to 1929.’

Assess the validity of this judgement.

(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

In relation to Kamenev, Zinoviev and the Right Communists, it could be argued that debates about Party policy were crucial in eclipsing their hopes of political power. These key political and economic issues were also important in relation to Stalin and Trotsky, but the personalities and political skills of these two men were equally significant.

Debates within the Party focused on three main areas: firstly, the question of future leadership – a single leader or collective leadership? Fear of Trotsky and his perceived arrogance and political convictions led the Party to favour rule by committee, which gave the initiative to Stalin. Secondly, the debate over Permanent Revolution supported by Trotsky (although the prospects of World Revolution had ground to a halt by the 1920s) versus Socialism in One Country – this appeal to nationalism and patriotism promoted by Stalin seemed to many in the Party to be more in line with the USSR’s industrial and agricultural needs. Finally, there was the debate over the future of the NEP – whether to keep the policy going as the economy continued to recover, or end capitalist practices and go for rapid industrialisation. With impressive pragmatic adeptness, Stalin would outvote Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev in 1925 in defence of the NEP, then turn against the Right Communists of Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky in 1927-8 to demonstrate that the NEP was no longer working.

In terms of personalities, Stalin seemed safe, ordinary and non-threatening, but beneath this bland and grey exterior there was a ruthless and skilful politician with a superb grasp of tactics. His ‘divide and rule’ tactics would serve him well against all his political opponents who would fatally underestimate him. Trotsky, on the other hand, though outwardly extrovert, confident and intellectual, was feared and unpopular. He was also highly-strung and prone to moments of indecision in crises; his eloquence tended to isolate him and he suffered from bouts of ill health. His tactical errors included his failure to attend Lenin’s funeral, his criticism of the cult of Leninism and his factional collusion with other opponents.

Candidates may also stress the importance of Stalin’s political power base, especially as General Secretary and his position within the politburo and triumvirate. The combination of these offices with the power of patronage made Stalin the indispensable link in the Party and government network. Despite his apparent position of strength within the Red Army, Trotsky had no equivalent political power base with no organised body of supporters. Mention may also be made of the importance of Lenin’s Testament and of the lack of a clear power structure.

At Level 1, answers will be generalised, having little of this range, perhaps focusing in brief on either personalities or policies. Level 2 will have more range but may be descriptive, possibly concentrating on the personalities of Stalin and Trotsky. Level 3 will be more explicitly analytical and better balanced, with some signs of synoptic links between policies and personalities, but

development will be limited and judgement perhaps only implicit. This will be evident at Level 4, with candidates effectively integrating policies, personalities and political skills to reach a more balanced assessment. Level 5 would sustain this sort of insight and overview, making clear synoptic links.

Question 3

‘The loyalty of the German people towards the Nazi regime in the years 1933 to 1939 was the result of genuine support rather than of effective propaganda.’

Assess the validity of this judgement.

(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

From the moment Hitler became Chancellor in January 1933, there was already extensive support from the German people for the Nazi regime. The Nazis embodied many of the basic attitudes of a large section of the German people – there was an ideological consensus based on national community, recalling a glorious past, and strong leadership in a society where law and order were present and crime was reduced to a minimum. The Nazis were already the most popular party by 1933, and successfully extended this loyalty in the initial period through the atmosphere of national euphoria, and the early stages of the Nazification of German society and elimination of all opposition.

However, every aspect of life was controlled by the Nazis through propaganda, indoctrination and fear – questioning genuine loyalty. For all Germans, life was punctuated by officially decreed festivities, rallies and mass demonstrations. Long-term indoctrination of the population involved regular exposure to official propaganda, effectively used especially via the radio, but the regime was never able to use the press to generate support, and bland journalism produced a decline of interest and sales. The most effective propaganda focus was of course Hitler himself – he used monopoly control of the media to good effect. If at times there was some general unease about the Nazi regime, Hitler struck a chord with the German people. The effectiveness of propaganda is difficult to assess in terms of genuine support – anti-church propaganda was arguably counter-productive. Perhaps propaganda mainly reinforced existing attitudes, or made people toe the line out of fear. Hopefully, candidates will want to distinguish between open enthusiastic support and begrudging more negative support – organised resistance was of course impossible and there were no alternatives to Nazism; but not all groups of Germans supported the regime, and incidents such as ‘Kristallnacht’ were not popular among the order-loving German public. For most, protest though was no more than low-key grumbles and complaints, with widespread political indifference as people acquiesced with no wish to get involved with the Gestapo, although by 1939 there were 140,000 political prisoners in camps. The use of terror and repression did largely enforce obedience, if not loyalty or genuine support.

Nazi achievements would also promote genuine support – foreign policy, national pride, law and order, and especially economic recovery; certainly the revival of the economy contributed

greatly to the German people's acceptance, or at least tolerance, of the regime, amid all the signs of the Reich's brutality, oppression and the constraints of dictatorship. Such organisations as the DAF (Strength through Joy) had some success in making the German working class feel that there was now greater equality of opportunity in the Nazi *volksgemeinschaft*. To provide some balance, candidates might also consider those groups which actively failed to support the Nazis – elements within the Church, the army and the dissident youth, and the extent to which Germans were living in a police state and were unable to voice their true opinions.

Level 1 might provide limited examples of support or broad generalisations about loyalty. Unless carefully related to the question, pre-1933 material is irrelevant. The same sort of approach is likely at Level 2 but in more detail, tending to describe loyalty and support rather than assess the reasons for it. Signs of an analytical insight should be evident at Level 3 with an explicit attempt to assess loyalty, perhaps distinguishing between Hitler and his regime, and showing some awareness of how different groups reacted in different ways to different issues. The distinction between genuine support and manufactured loyalty through propaganda might be developed at Level 4, distinguishing between open, enthusiastic support and begrudging more negative support. Level 5 answers will be well argued throughout, offering clear and well supported judgement.

Question 4

Compare how effectively Stalin and Hitler established political control over the state, with reference to the USSR in the years 1928 to 1939 and to Germany in the years 1933 to 1939. (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

For both dictators, there are a number of possible staging posts on the way to assessing how effectively they established political control. Stalin and Hitler obviously came to power in different circumstances and political contexts, and in terms of the criteria needed for political control, both leaders had different priorities – eliminate opposition, control own party, gain executive powers, control armed forces, secure effective measures for terror and repression, establish a system of propaganda and indoctrination etc. The role of the leader himself will also be important in reaching conclusions.

When Hitler came to power in January 1933, Germany was a multi-party democracy. His main priority was to neutralise this opposition, and, arguably, this was achieved quickly and effectively. By the summer of 1933, with the powers of the Enabling Act, Hitler was able to ban opposition from trade unions and political parties, and begin the process of Nazification within the civil service, judiciary, teaching profession, press etc – although at this stage he failed to make any impression on the influence of the Churches, big business and the army, and was clearly wary of antagonising such powerful vested interests. In 1934, Hitler successfully eliminated the two remaining political threats – by August, he had secured his own personal political supremacy with the purge of the SA in the 'Night of the Long Knives', the assumption of the Presidency on Hindenburg's death, and an oath of allegiance sworn by the army. Yet

perhaps it was only after 1937 that Hitler finally established political control when big business was brought into line, and the dismissal of Blomberg and Fritsch secured control over the armed forces.

Did Stalin have political control from the start, or only after the Five Year Plans took effect, or after the Purges? When he came to power, the USSR, unlike Germany, was already a one-party state-run dictatorship which controlled all institutions. The new leader's main priority was to enforce centralised economic control over the nation through the Five Year Plans – Stalin also saw this as a means of consolidating his political control over the Party and government. This policy would prove to be brutally effective. However, was it only after the Purges that his total political control over personnel, Party, government, armed forces and people was confirmed? Or was this opposition more imagined than real, as the propaganda of the public show trials and the self-destruction of the Soviet military imply?

In considering the role of the two dictators in establishing political control, candidates should be able to provide some clear comparison. In theory, Hitler had unlimited political control, and *Fuhrerprinzip* formed the basis of state organisation, ensuring unquestioning obedience at all levels; yet he remained remote from day-to-day government, often uncertain or unwilling in decision making, and bored by administrative detail and organisation – Hitler still depended on subordinates to put policy decisions into effect. Furthermore, internal divisions and rivalries were never entirely overcome, and Hitler's Reich presented an array of rival hierarchies, competing centres of power and ambiguous chains of command. In contrast, decision making in the USSR was centred wholly around Stalin in the Kremlin, where all the threads of information came together. Stalin was the only person who saw the whole picture, with decisions then cascading down through the chain of command – but was this effective in practice? Local officials had their own priorities and agendas, inhibiting centralised political control, as did other factions and rivalries within the Party, and the chaotic and confused layers of administration.

Level 1 answers might tackle only one dictatorship, or make a sweeping generalised response to both, without responding clearly to 'political control over the state' or 'how effectively'. Level 2 will respond to both states but may still be unbalanced overall, and may be predominantly factual narrative describing how the two dictators established political control, but with little assessment or comparison. By Level 3, there should be some limited signs of comparison, and some explicit response to the question, but the essay will still lack balance and development. Level 4 will develop this comparative and synoptic approach, and might include some assessment of the personal roles of the two dictators. Level 5 will sustain a broad conceptual understanding and reach convincing conclusions with clear synoptic links.