



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

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

A2 Unit 4: Totalitarian Ideologies, Economic, Social and Foreign Policies, 1848–1956

Section A: The Origins and Development of ‘Totalitarian Ideologies’, 1848-1956

Question 1

- (a) Use **Sources C** and **D** and your own knowledge.
How fully do **Sources C** and **D** explain the reasons for increasing state control of the economy in non-communist totalitarian regimes? (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 sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Draws conclusions about 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 sufficiency in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

Weaker answers at Level 1 may simply describe the content of the sources. At Level 2 answers may refer to the fact that Source C identifies two reasons for state control – the appointment of Goering with a broad responsibility for the economy, and the influence of the radical socialist wing of the party. It also identified the lack of business opposition to increased state control. Source D refers to the reasons why Mussolini believed the corporate state was introduced. It also refers to ‘strength’ and ‘collaboration’ key concepts in Fascist ideology. Finally it suggests public order was a factor, stressing the political reasons for economic control.

However, for Level 3 and above answers should identify limitations of the sources. Overy is writing about the role of business, without reference to the development of the four-year plan with its aim of preparation for war. It might also be argued that the influence of the radical socialist wing has been exaggerated as it had been destroyed in 1934. It is Thyssen’s opinion that the state was engaged in ‘bolshevisation’ and the idea of Hitler deliberately following Bolshevik ideas is not sustainable. Source D is limited by the fact that the source comes from Mussolini who inevitably would be seeking to justify his ‘third way’. It also precedes the 1932 Doctrine of Fascism, which went on to articulate the reasons for control – candidates may point out that Mussolini was in power throughout the 1930s and we have no evidence of why state control grew in this decade.

Judgement for Level 4 could be shown by attempting to compare the value of the sources, arguing for the benefit of hindsight against the value of a contemporary viewpoint.

- (b) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.
 'The economic ideas of totalitarian regimes were based on nineteenth century ideas.'
 Assess the validity of this view with regard to the economic ideas of Stalin and Hitler.
 (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.

Descriptions of the sources or of policy rather than ideology are likely at Level 1. At Level 2 analytical answers should be aware that the Soviet Union's ideology was clearly influenced by the ideas of Marx. Class antagonism and the belief in the abolition of private property (**Source A**) was responsible for the ideas of Lenin's War Communism, including requisitioning and nationalisation of industry. Stalin's Five Year Plans sought to destroy all private property and develop the size of the proletariat; collectivisation sought to end class antagonism by creating a rural proletarian spirit in the countryside and by destroying the bourgeois Kulak class (**Source B**). **Source C** makes clear that industrialists like Thyssen believed that there was a 'backdoor bolshevisation' taking place as the Nazi state sought to take control of industry. Reference to ideas of nationalisation and Empire may be seen, linked to Nazi ideas of autarky and Lebensraum.

However, balance at Level 3 and beyond requires reference to the limits of nineteenth century ideas. In the Soviet Union, the Bolshevik revolution was not a Marxist revolution, with the result that the regime had a majority of peasants and the political system had to determine the economy (not vice versa as Marx believed). The result of this was the compromise of the NEP (hence the existence of free use of land etc **Source B**) and the need to force collectivisation and industrialisation on a reluctant population. In Nazi Germany, state control was only to advance the drive for war. Nazi ideology focused far more on the need for a war economy, removal of Jews and women from the economy and the promotion of the agricultural sector in keeping with the Blood and Soil ideas of the regime.

Answers that argue that the Soviet Union was influenced by Marxist ideas, but Nazi Germany was not influenced by nineteenth century ideas would normally have balance for Level 3, but lack wide range for Level 4. Judgement at Level 5 may recognise that there was some early Marxist influence on Nazi ideology, but once Hitler was in power this was limited, whereas Marxism was a constant influence in the Soviet Union, but that the methods used to achieve it varied.

Section B: Policy and Practice in Totalitarian Regimes

Question2

‘The Five Year plans achieved their goals.’

Assess the validity of this verdict with reference to industrial production and control of industry in the Soviet Union in the years 1928 to 1941. (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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)

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**

Indicative content

Answers should consider the success and failure of the first three Five Year Plans.

At Level 1 answers may describe economic policy.

At Level 2 answers should cover success or failure, or some, but not all, of the synoptic factors. Industrial production did increase, with coal production going from 34.3 million tonnes to 150 million tonnes and the achievement of 'Five Years in Four', machine tool production exceeded the plan and the Soviet Union became almost entirely self-sufficient, the development of the world's largest airforce and the Soviet Union's share of world manufacturing was second only to the USA according to contemporaries. Industry was successfully controlled with harsh labour laws, internal passports, trials of industrial experts (Shakhty trials) to crush resistance to the tempo of the plans.

At Level 3 answers should offer balance, covering success and failure in most of the identified areas. Failures in production include the failure to fulfil the plan in most areas in the first and third plans and the emphasis on quantity rather than quality, and in control of industry in the inability of Gosplan to allocate resources correctly and plan industrial development leading to anomalies like the completion of factories that were then flooded by the opening of a dam.

Answers at Level 4 should demonstrate a wide range of evidence by appropriately selecting statistical evidence.

At Level 5 judgement may take the form of presenting an independent viewpoint as opposed to the contemporary Soviet viewpoint.

Question 3

How far was Soviet involvement in the Spanish Civil War, in the years 1936 to 1939, and the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact in August 1939 consistent with Soviet ideology?
(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

At Level 1 answers may simply describe events in the 1930s.

At Level 2 analytical responses may consider the consistency of Soviet involvement in Spain with the goal of promoting world-wide revolution, as aid to the Spanish Republic aided the establishment of a Communist dominated government. It also meant opposing the spread of Fascism. There may also be evidence that the Nazi-Soviet Pact was a betrayal of ideology.

Balanced answers at Level 3 and beyond should show appreciation that Soviet involvement in Spain was limited to advisors, an opportunistic acquisition of Spanish gold reserves and the opportunity to murder Spanish Trotskyites.

Conceptual understanding at Level 4 might involve arguing that the Nazi-Soviet Pact was consistent with ideology as it created the circumstances in which capitalism and Nazism could fight each other to a standstill, which would then allow a Soviet takeover of Europe, which indeed happened in 1945.

Judgement at Level 5 may involve arguing that both policies were meant to preserve peace for as long as possible, to enable the Soviet Union to prepare for the inevitable war, which had to be survived for the long-term future of communism.

Question 4

‘The Nazi economy was focused on preparing Germany for war rather than on improving living standards.’

Assess the validity of this view of Nazi economic policy in the years 1933 to 1941.

(20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

The question is an opportunity for candidates to consider the guns v butter debate.

At Level 1 answers may describe economic policy.

At Level 2 analysis of preparation for war may be seen, without consideration of whether living standards were improved. Alternatively, both synoptic factors may be covered in outline.

At Level 3 balance should be achieved by consideration of evidence that challenges the statement, though it may not cover evidence both that war was not the focus and that living standards were.

At Level 4 wide range would be demonstrated by covering evidence for and against the validity of the statement with reference to both synoptic factors. Synoptic understanding may be demonstrated by assessment of the inter-relationship of the two factors, e.g. part of preparation for war was improving living standards.

At Level 5 independent judgement should involve looking beyond the standard debate to develop a personal response.

Evidence the economy focused on war, not living standards

- Work creation schemes included autobahns which would be used to transport troops
- Two thirds of investment went into arms 1936–1939
- Four Year Plan
- Industries that benefited from Nazi rule were those producing for war e.g. IG Farben & Krupps
- Schmitt (1934) removed as he wanted to cut spending on arms
- Goering empowered to prepare for war, displacing the conservative Schacht
- Goering nationalised key industries e.g. Fokker
- 1939 onwards increased control of industry to increase war production – huge programme of weapons, submarines, aircraft and explosives
- 1939–1941 consumer consumption fell by 20%

Evidence the economy focused on living standards, not/as well as war

- New Plan tried to allow both
- Public spending 1933–1936 was used to reduce unemployment
- The targets of the Four Year Plan were not met because of the need to continue a high standard of living
- Subsidised food in the winter of 1934–1945
- Only 17% of GNP on arms by 1938 & only 47% in 1941 (Britain 60%)
- Production of consumer goods (e.g. textiles and furniture) increased 1932 to 1938
- 40% steel still used for civilian needs in 1939
- No increase in working hours for industrial workers

Question 5

‘Nazi foreign policies in the years 1933 to 1941 were driven by race and living space.’
How valid is 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 at Level 1 may just describe some aspects of racial and/or expansionist policy.

At Level 2 answers should consider the role played by race and Lebensraum in Nazi foreign policy.

At Level 3 balance will involve challenging the significance of the synoptic factors.

At Level 4 synoptic understanding may involve understanding of the inter-relationship of Hitler’s hatred of Slavs with his desire to acquire living space in Poland and the western USSR.

At Level 5 independent judgement may take the form of arguing that overturning the Treaty of Versailles or anti-communism was more important in this period.

Evidence for Race

- Uniting German speaking people in the Anschluss, acquisition of the Sudetenland and Memel

- Desire for alliance with Britain
- The Anglo-German Naval Agreement, where Hitler ordered von Ribbentrop to renegotiate a lower ratio to avoid upsetting the nation he admired as fellow Aryan Imperialists
- Actions of the five Einsatzgruppen units sent into Poland in September 1939

Evidence for Space

- Invasion of Poland
- Commitment to war with the USSR in speeches throughout the period

Evidence against Race

- Non-Aggression Pact with Poland, 1934
- Rome-Berlin Axis, Anti-Comintern Pact and Pact of Steel all suggest anti-communism and expansionism was more important
- Hitler was at war with Britain in 1939, allied to the Japanese and had signed a non-Aggression Pact with the USSR

Evidence against Space

- Imperialist takeover of Bohemia and Moravia in March 1939
- Nazi-Soviet Pact was the antithesis of plans for living space

Question 6

'The establishment of the Corporate State, rather than the outcome of economic 'battles', was the greatest success of the Italian economy.'
Assess the validity of this view of 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 at Level 1 may describe the corporate state or the economic battles.

At Level 2 answers should focus on the success in creating the Corporate State or the successes of the battles (for births, the lira, land).

At Level 3 balance would involve challenging the statement and considering the success of the battles and/or the failures of the Corporate State.

At Level 4 synoptic understanding would be demonstrated by considering the relative success of the two policies. Wide range would involve understanding of the success and failure of both synoptic factors.

At Level 5 independent judgement may include arguing that preparation for war was a greater success, or that the propaganda image of success was the real triumph.

Evidence the Corporate State was a success

- Avoided the exploitation of capitalism and the lack of incentives of socialism
- The creation of the Corporate State brought unity and harmony
- Corporate boards providing a forum for input from employers, employees and Fascist officials in a new 'third way'

- Corporate state had some success in solving industrial disputes
- Ensured that the economy could be focused on war production

Evidence the battles were not as successful

- Wheat remained the third biggest import
- Birth rate did not increase
- Quota 90 damaged Italian exports

Evidence the Corporate State was less successful

- The corporate state never really created harmony, as fascist officials were frequently in the pay of the large companies
- Fascist terror was needed to keep the workers in check
- Mussolini had to order wage cuts to prevent inflation after the Wall Street Crash

Evidence the battles were a success

- Draining of the Pontine Marshes
- Wheat production doubled

Question 7

How far was Italian foreign policy in the years 1933 to 1940 motivated more by anti-communism than by support for fellow fascists abroad? (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 at Level 1 will describe some aspects of foreign policy or discuss generally the relationship between Italy and Germany. Focus may be on pre-1933.

At Level 2 analysis may focus on both synoptic factors, but fail to challenge their significance. Assessment of success should include some explicit focus on aims.

At Level 3 balance will involve understanding that policies of anti-communism and/or support for fellow fascists were not consistently followed.

At Level 4 wide range will involve understanding of the limits of both synoptic factors. Synoptic understanding may involve consideration of which of the two policies was most significant.

At Level 5 independent judgement may involve arguing that other motives were stronger, e.g. desire to create an Empire.

Evidence of anti-communism

- Aid to the Spanish Nationalists and the presentation to the Italian people of the war being part of the struggle against communism
- Joining the Anti-Comintern Pact in 1937

Evidence of support for fellow fascists

- Rome-Berlin Axis
- Fighting with Hitler in the Spanish Civil War
- Anti-Comintern Pact

- Allowing the Anschluss
- Support for Hitler's expansionism at Munich
- Pact of Steel

Evidence that challenges anti-communism

- Did not prevent USSR joining the League of Nations in 1934
- Close economic links with the USSR through to 1938 – oil imports from the USSR increased 1936–1938

Evidence that challenges support for fellow fascists

- Prevented the Anschluss in 1934
- Attacked Hitler as a barbarian and a pederast at the time of the abortive Anschluss
- Stresa Declaration
- Failed to keep to the terms of the Pact of Steel and did not go to war in 1939

Question 8

'Domestic economic weakness led to a more defensive foreign policy than the dictator would have liked.'

Assess the validity of this view of any **one** of the totalitarian regimes you have studied.

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 at Level 1 may assert economic weakness.

At Level 2 answers may focus on economic or foreign policy.

For balance at Level 3 answers should consider the impact of economic weakness on foreign policy, with explicit reference to defensive measures. There should be some challenge to the question.

Synoptic understanding at Level 4 should be demonstrated explicitly by considering the inter-relationship of the economy and foreign policy, and/or by considering the relative importance of a weak economy and other factors responsible for a more defensive foreign policy.

At Level 5 independent judgement may involve appreciation of changing policies at different times.

Stalin needed to develop the economy during the Five Year Plans, making policies of collective security, joining the capitalist League of Nations and ultimately signing the Nazi-Soviet Pact, necessary. But, these policies were also the consequence of Soviet isolation as the world's only communist country. Furthermore, Nazi aggression and the lack of reliable allies was also responsible. Finally there was Soviet aggression, not when the economy was strong necessarily, but when the international situation allowed it (partition of Poland, war with Finland, annexation of the Baltic States).

Hitler was constrained by economic weakness, with little aggression before 1935. When challenged over the attempted Anschluss, Hitler had to back down. However, after 1935 Hitler

was essentially aggressive, regardless of the economic position of Germany – after all Germany was arguably not ready for war in 1939.

Mussolini did spend a ‘decade of good behaviour’ in the 1920s when the Italian economy was still suffering from the impact of Liberal governments and from the legacy of the First World War. Furthermore, in 1939 he was unable to join Hitler in the European War because of the economic weakness of Italy. However, Mussolini was aggressive in the early 1920s (Corfu) and the 1930s (Abyssinia and Spain) and arguably at no time would the economy have been considered strong. Involvement in Spain was crippling for the economy, but Mussolini sent c.70,000 troops.