



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative E Unit 4

Mark Scheme

2008 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 © 2008 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 2008

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

A2 Unit 4: Germany, Russia and the Soviet Union in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

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

Question 1

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

How useful are **Sources B** and **D** in explaining how Lenin and Stalin sought to justify the reasons for their dictatorships? (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, with only limited links to the question. Responses at Level 2 may also be source-led, but might provide some contextual evidence on the problems facing Lenin following the election at the end of 1917 in Russia, and on Stalin's need to control the economy of the USSR. However, answers at this level might still be restricted to a general context or to utility in general terms, largely accepting the sources at face value. Both a range of contextual knowledge and some signs of balanced evaluation should be explicit at Level 3, with some conclusions reached in terms of 'how useful', appreciating the propaganda value of the sources. Both leaders argue pragmatically that there is no alternative. For Lenin, there was no way of avoiding the election, but the Bolsheviks were in no position to win; he now had the choice of either losing power or seizing power through the Party in the name of the proletariat, despite the inevitable prospects of civil war. In the early 1930s, with parts of the USSR in a virtual state of civil war, Stalin was under pressure to slow the pace of the Five Year Plans, but needed to extend his political authority. 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 developed insight into utility for both sources. Having only just seized power through the October Revolution, Lenin was not about to hand it over to another body as the result of democratic processes which he despised as being a relic of a past era. Stalin uses Lenin to emphasise a central theme of indoctrination – that the very survival of the Soviet state and the Revolution depends on economic overhaul and centralised state control.

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

‘Autocratic governments remained in power because the movements wanting change and reform were weak and divided.’

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.

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, identify the main focal points in both Russia and Germany, and select evidence over the period about the strength and effectiveness 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 two main themes for candidates to consider; whether reform movements were weak and divided throughout the period, and also the reasons for the survival of autocratic governments. Autocratic rule remained strong because of military and political control, and the support of elite groups with a vested interest in resisting change. At different times, a combination of unquestioned loyalty, deferential acceptance and popular support reinforced autocratic governments and undermined reform movements. Once again, it might be useful to divide the period up into three phases; the rule of the monarchist autocracies up to the end of the First World War, with movements in both states attempting to achieve change and reform; the unsuccessful reformist governments which replaced the monarchies; and ultimately the return to autocracy in both states with little scope for opposition.

In Germany, Source A provides plenty of clear evidence of the class divisions and lack of political consciousness in 1848 which enabled the King and princes to survive. During the Second Reich, a combination of elitist dominance and political expediency within a sham constitution managed to contain developing reform movements, although the growing strength and support for the SPD signalled an ominous warning. The creation of the Weimar Republic marked the most significant success for reform movements, but German society remained deeply divided and the regime failed to secure the support of a people demoralised by defeat in war and economic turmoil. The Republic faced opposition on all sides, although Source C suggests that an exaggerated 'Red Threat' provided the scope for the right-wing opposition to strengthen its grip. Hitler's authoritarian regime effectively smothered any potential reform movements.

The backward nature of 19th century tsarist Russia restricted the development of movements wanting change and reform – the state was largely comprised of illiterate peasants who were conditioned to accept and support the autocratic tsarist regime. This is confirmed by 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. Although the movement which overthrew Tsar Nicholas II in March 1917 seemed neither weak nor divided, the resulting Provisional Government was short-lived and provoked little support. Source B confirms that, following the overthrow of the Provisional Government through its lack of reform and change, the failure of the non-Bolshevik parties to unite against Lenin ultimately enabled the Communists to set up a dictatorship. Any hopes of change and reform with the less prescriptive NEP were ended when Stalin became leader. Source D gives insight into Stalin's strengthening state control, and effective propaganda and indoctrination would eliminate any prospective opposition.

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; the content might also be restricted to the context 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 the issues raised in the question, but this will not be balanced nor developed (comment may again be restricted to the source contexts), and there will be only 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 different social and political contexts 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

'Stalin and Hitler were able to achieve power because of their political skills rather than the mistakes of their opponents.'

Assess the validity of this judgement in comparing the reasons for the rise to power of Stalin in the USSR by 1929 and Hitler in Germany by January 1933. (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 comparing the rise to power of the two dictators, candidates will need to assess a range of issues: leadership skills, opponents' mistakes and also other appropriate factors. Hitler was extremely talented as an orator, with charisma and emotional appeal, successfully pinpointing the frustrations of many Germans. He skilfully bided his time after 1930 and out-thought those who believed they could tame him. Hitler's personal authority, however, was ensured and complemented by the party organisation and ideology, and he was ably supported by Goebbels' propaganda and also financial backing. Hitler's own strengths did not extend to party administration. As for the mistakes of Hitler's opponents, political intrigue, self-interest and fatal under-estimation, after 1930 certainly played into his hands, with the use of emergency powers under Article 48 and the effective end of true parliamentary government. The rivalry between von Papen and Schleicher, and Hindenburg's vulnerability gave Hitler scope to use his political skills, as did the broader political and economic context of Weimar Germany – constitutional weakness with continued coalition government under proportional representation; economic instability peaking with the impact of the Wall Street Crash on Germany, providing Hitler with an electoral breakthrough, as the German people turned to political extremism and the conservative elites united around the Nazi alternative.

Stalin's skills were, in contrast far less extrovert and much more manipulative with a superb grasp of political tactics. His power base as General Secretary and within the politburo and triumvirate made Stalin the indispensable link in the party and government network, with the influential power of patronage. His personal ruthlessness would serve him well in his 'divide and rule' tactics against Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev and the Right Communists. His 'Socialism in One Country' proved to be a skilful and pragmatic approach to future policy. Against all this are the mistakes, divisions, tactics, policies and over-confidence of his opponents, who virtually destroyed each other in fatally under-estimating Stalin. In particular, candidates might single out Trotsky's tactical mistakes, his lack of power base, his persistent adherence to World Revolution and factional collusion with other opponents. Stalin's success also included some element of good fortune, with no clear power structure handed down from Lenin, and over the Testament and the 1926 harvest.

Level 1 might tackle only one dictator, or two in minimal detail, providing a condensed narrative summary of the rise to power. Level 2 will respond to both dictators with more range, but will provide mainly a general descriptive narrative, with little sign of comparison, except as broad links. At Level 3, candidates will respond explicitly to the question, start to compare and make synoptic links, appreciating a range of factors but lacking balance and development. These aspects will be evident at Level 4 with more integration – perhaps comparing the different political contexts for their opponents, with the conservative right in Germany believing they

could use Hitler to secure their own political influence; whereas the rival communists in the USSR already had power in a one-party state. Candidates might also compare the contrasting personalities – the extrovert talents of Hitler with the more introspective machinations of Stalin. A full range of issues will be integrated at Level 5 with a sustained comparison.

Question 3

‘The Soviet state gained but at the expense of the Soviet people.’

How accurate is this assessment of the economic and social impact of Stalin’s dictatorship in the USSR in the years 1928 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

Given the scale of economic backwardness in post-revolutionary Russia, drastic action was needed. Agriculture had to be mechanised to provide more food to the growing towns and cities while transferring a large part of the rural population to urban industrial employment. Stalinist propaganda would project his leadership as the fulfilment of Leninist-Marxism with gains for all. Alternatively, Stalin’s dictatorship can be seen as the gross misuse of power at the expense of the Soviet people, perverting Leninist-Marxism and merely creating a totalitarian state. However, given the state of the economy in 1928, Stalin’s dictatorship made massive gains for the state, even if the process was crude and chaotic.

For the state, in terms of the government and party, the gains seem clear – the true dawn of socialism for all Russians, the end of the class struggle with the transformation of Soviet society, and a planned, centralised economy to consolidate political power and bring national survival. The peasant base of the USSR had to be changed if the economy and society were to be modernised, but the means led to brutality and death.

It is difficult to see anything positive from collectivisation as gains for either the state or the people – decline in production, loss of livestock and a vast toll in human lives, with the elimination of the Kulaks and rural famine. The much-heralded mechanisation was slow to arrive. The meagre gain of a surplus peasant labour force would benefit industrialisation and shift the balance of the workforce. The Five Year Plans brought to industry the gains of increased production, better communications, new resources, and key developments in the iron, oil and electricity industries. For the majority of the Soviet people, however, the impact of economic development meant a starved consumer sector, living in over-crowded squalor and appalling working conditions – repression, coercion, workbooks, labour camps etc – which undermined the social fabric through fear and alienation. The costs of administrative inefficiency and a lack of realism with unrealistic production quotas were paid by ‘saboteurs’ and ‘wreckers’, and those who placed selfish material gain above benefits for the nation.

The fracturing of society by enforced collectivisation and industrialisation was predominantly negative, but this was a social revolution of massive proportions which did bring self-promotion and upward mobility for many. Candidates might include comment on such issues as urbanisation, education, literacy and training, women and the family, religion, health services etc. Many of the perceived gains seemed no more than propaganda projections. For the Soviet people, Stalin's dictatorship became a collective nightmare, demanding total compliance.

Level 1 may only provide a narrow focus, perhaps with sweeping assertive comment. Level 2 might concentrate on a review of the Five Year Plans with only general analytical links. By Level 3, there should be some appreciation of the full scope of the question, although the response may be predominantly economic and lacking in balance and development. Social aspects should show some development at Level 4 and a broadening of the analysis with evidence of synoptic links, perhaps contrasting Stalin's perspective with that of the Soviet people. What choices did Stalin have in trying to industrialise an agrarian society in the shortest possible time? Level 5 should analyse a full range of issues and reach some conclusions.

Question 4

'Hitler achieved a political revolution but failed to bring about a social revolution.'
Assess the validity of this verdict on Nazi 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

At the highest levels, candidates will need to construct a balanced debate in relation to both aspects of the question, and provide an analytical overview with clear synoptic links.

In political terms, there seems to be a revolution in the nature of the state with fundamental change – a single-party terroristic state without civil liberties, trade unions, federal authority, intolerant of any opposition and driven by the forces of state security. Yet there are elements of continuity with the past, including strong leadership, and some compromise with the political elites and major forces of the army, big business, the civil service and, to a lesser extent, the churches. The formulation and implementation of policy seems fragmented and inefficient. Hitler's own role should be included in this, seen either in control of the main aspects of government decision making with a deliberate policy of divide and rule, or whose sudden impulses reflected the disorganised confusion of the political system.

In terms of social revolution, Hitler aimed to transform German society with the idea of 'Volksgemeinschaft', a community of Germans working together regardless of background or role in society – a revolutionary consensus overcoming past divisions with a new common purpose in a racial but classless society, offering better opportunities for social advancement. Alternatively, this can be seen as merely reinforcing traditional class alignments and established elites. To assess the degree of social change, candidates could draw on evidence from many areas, including education, youth movement, the role of women and the family, culture, religion,

anti-Semitism etc. The revolutionary role of propaganda could also be included, specifically in manufacturing and maintaining Hitler's image.

Level 1 will only provide a partial coverage of this content. Level 2 will not cover the full range of political and social aspects, and will tend to be descriptive, general and unbalanced. Level 3 will show better range and signs of analysis, but is likely merely to accept the given propositions. Level 4 will present a more balanced debate with a broader perspective and clear synoptic links between the two aspects, perhaps focusing specifically on Hitler's role. Judgement at Level 5 would appreciate the varying degree of change across the range of issues and provide a convincing overview.